OF THE

DIVISION

BETVVEEN

The {ENGLISH AND ROMISH} *Church*

VPON THE

REFORMATION.

By way of Answer to the seeming plausible Pretences of the *ROMISH* Party.

Much enlarged in this Edition:
By H. FERNE D. D.

ACT. 24. 14.
After the way, which they call Heresie, so worship I the God of my fathers, &c.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. G.* for *Richard Royston*, at the Angel in Ivie-lane, 1655.

To the Reader.

Ood Reader, *This Treatiſe was intended for private Satisfaction, but falling under the View of ſome, that were able to judge, and liked well of it, (better than it deſerved) it was thought not unfit for more publick uſe. And the Author (then farre off in the North) was importuned, not onely to give his conſent to the putting it forth, but to help it forward himſelf, by prefacing ſomething to it, for the fairer bringing it forth into Open light. Know therefore, (Good Reader) and well conſider it, that theſe are ſuch times as the Apoſtle foretold,* 2 Tim. Perilous (*difficult and troubleſome*) times, 2 Tim. 3. 1. *Times in which it would be hard for good Chriſtians to know how to behave themſelves with ſafety; the dangers of theſe daies threatning, not onely the outward eſtate or world-*

ly concernments, but attempting Conſcience and Religion it ſelf, and that on the one hand and on the other.

They of the old Romiſh Superſtition pretending Antiquity, and a preſent flouriſhing condition of a Church: They of the new perſwaſion boaſting ſucceſſe, and holding forth New lights to carry aſide.

As in the day of Jeruſalem, *both the Children of* Edom *and of* Babylon *cried,* Down with it, down with it, *Pſal.* 137. They ſaw the trouble of *Jeruſalem*, and were glad that the Lord had done it, *Lam.* 1. 21. *So it is with the true* Proteſtant *Church in this Land, now troubled and diſtreſſed. The Enemies on either ſide rejoicing, that the Lord hath done it to us.*

A pitifull thing it is, (and one argument more for Lamentation, *than* Jeremiah *had for his) that the enemies of a Chriſtian Church, ſhould be ſuch on both ſides, as profeſſe themſelves Chriſtians, acknowledge One Saviour, look for one Hope; and though agreeing all in the main, yet becauſe of different perſwaſions in Religion, can be content, yea and rejoice to ſee a Chriſtian Church to fall, and to be (if they might have their will) thrown quite off from the Foundation, on which they profeſſe themſelves*

ſelves to be built, rather than ſee it ſtand there, otherwiſe, than juſt as they doe, and according to their frame.

How much were it to be wiſhed, and to be prayed for, that the Lord would roll away this reproach of Ægypt, Joſ. 5. 9. *from off the name of Chriſtians, this uncircumciſion, this hardneſſe of heart? that he would take away this* perverſe Spirit he has mingled *among us, (as* Iſa. 19. 14.*) from whence ariſe ſuch Debates, and contentions, not onely about the things of Earth, but of Heaven too: the Affairs and buſineſſe of the State, and of the Church too.*

As for thoſe of the Romiſh *perſwaſion, when I look at thoſe points of Religion controverted between us, which concern not the ſpecial and politick concernments of that Church (ſuch as* Univerſal Juriſdiction, *and that which follows on it,* Univerſal Subjection, *and that which muſt maintain the former,* Infallibility, *and the like) I cannot but think, there might be a poſſibility of ſome peaceable and fair Chriſtian agreement. Yea, and were there Reaſon and Equity in men, inſtead of that pretended* Infallibility, *to agree and ſtay upon the due Authority of free General Councels, and inſtead of the now exorbitant power of the*

Bishop of Rome, *to be content he should have onely the Antient* Patriarchal Primacy *allowed him in the first Generall Councels, I should not despair of agreement as to these points.*

But when I consider, how neerly the Guides of that Church take themselves to be concerned in these Politick Interesses, and what a numerous society there is of Jesuites devoted to maintain them, I must needs say, that hope seems vain, and conclude them engaged to hold where they are, and to condemn all other Christians, and Churches to the Gates of Hell, *that will not acknowledge the Church of* Rome *to be the onely Church, against which the* Gates of Hell *have not, nor can prevail by any errour in Faith or Worship.*

He that will look into the businesse of Religion before, and at the beginning of the Councel of Trent, *will easily see by the several Colloquies held between* Protestants, *and* Romanists, *what agreement some points were brought to, and what further condescension might have been, had not the Interesses of the Court of* Rome *disturbed all. Or if he look into those Relations and Histories we have of the Councel of* Trent *it self, he will see by the several discourses had*

had upon the points controverted, what moderation there was in many learned men, but rendred ineffectual, by reason that the Arcana Imperii, *those forementioned politick concernments of that Church, as they might not be once disputed, so they wholly over-ruled the other points of Religion, and excluded all Moderation in the Definitions of that Councel.*

All the Christian World sees, how long the poor distressed Eastern *Church has lain under that heavy condition, unpitied by Them of the* Romish *Communion; and how They have stood affected to us since our Reformation has sufficiently appeared by their several practices against us; What hand they had in our present troubles is not unknown to some; what joy they now take in them, let their own heart tell them; but what advantage they make of them for pervertin̄ of many, that is it we are to take notice of, and to withstand. I have opposed this Defence, such as it is, against their generall plausible pretences: framed indeed both for Matter and Form, most-what according to the scruples of Those, that occasioned it; but may generally serve to give some stay in these tottering Times to those, that have not a more able hand to hold and keep them steady.*

As

As for the Particular Doctrines of the Romish Church, some of the chief of them, (as Traditions, Infallibility, Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory) *are spoken to, as concerning* the Trial of Antiquity, *towards the End of this Treatise. Where it is by divers instances shewn, that they could not be doctrines of the Antient Church. I may happily finde time (with Gods help) to make a fuller enquiry upon these, and other their novel Articles; that it may appear, what is justly and necessarily controverted between us, either in matter of Faith or Worship: What may be waved, as needlesly quarrelled at, or agreed, as needlesly contended about: And of the controverted Points, which Doctrine, Theirs, or Ours, will upon the triall of direct Scripture, prove more Apostolical: which upon principles confessed by us both, will appear more safe and reasonable, and also more agreeable to true Christian humility and piety. But of this hereafter, as it shall please God to give opportunity, and ability.*

It remains, I should speak to that seeming advantage they would make of our disturbed condition, to the abusing of unwary Protestants into a perswasion, that we have

no Government, no Communion, no Church. Something is ſaid to it, in the Body of this Treatiſe, upon the point of Schiſme *and* Diviſion. *But to give the Reader farther ſatisfaction, it muſt be conſidered, First, It is no new thing to ſee a Church under the power of the Sword, oppreſſed by the hand of violence, perſecuted, ſcattered, and ſo deprived of the peace, order, and comlineſſe it had: Nor ought any Man to think, that he is not therefore in the Boſome of the Church, becauſe he cannot lie in it quietly and at eaſe, as formerly; or that it is beſt for him to ſtay no longer in the Ship, (as they thought,* Act. 27. 30,31.*) becauſe it is toſſed to and fro, with a heavy and tedious ſtorm. The Romaniſt, that judges much of things ſpiritual by the eye of ſenſe, cannot well like of Chriſtian worſhip, but when it is pompous and highly Ceremonious; nor of a Chriſtian Church, unleſſe it be glorioufly conſpicuous for outward ſplendour, and undiſturbed order. But then is Truth of moſt price, when it is* bought *at a dear rate, and not* ſold *upon any terms; when it is ſought out with great difficulty, and held upon as great diſadvantages; and then is Faith moſt pretious, when it is moſt tried, and ſtands under the greateſt prejudices.*

Secondly,

Secondly, Conſider, what has hapned to us, is faln upon us for Trial, and Humiliation: to the end, that they, which are approved, might be made manifeſt among us, (1 Cor. 11. 19.) *for the* Truth *they hold to, and the* Faith *they profeſſe; and that All might be humbled and corrected, the Sons of* Levi *eſpecially refined and purified,* Mal. 3. 3. *Our troubled condition therefore does not juſtifie the Church of* Rome, *nor ought to confirm any in the errour of that perſwaſion; but it condemns onely our iniquities, in being unanſwerable to that Peace and Truth we enjoyed: and calls for, not a forſaking of that way of Worſhip and Religion we were in, but of thoſe ſinnes by which wee provoked this wrath.*

Thirdly, Conſider, what has hapned to us, has to the ſame end and purpoſe often befaln the Church of God, without a diſſolution of it. If the Lord has now covered *this Church* with a cloud in his anger, *it is but what he did to* Zion, Lam. 2. 1. If in the indignation of his wrath *he* has deſpiſed both the King and the Prieſt, *it is that which* Jeremiah *lamented in the ſad condition of* Jeruſalem, Lam. 2. 9. *If* deſtroyed his places of Aſſembly (*as there*

com-

complained of) *it is not the deſtruction of a Church, but the want of that freedome it had of more publick Worſhip and Communion. Looke we into the Chriſtian Church, how it was trained up for ſome hundreds of yeares in ſuch a low and diſtreſſed condition; under perilous and difficult times for the moſt part, which ſeldome afforded them a ſecure liberty of due and orderly aſſembling together. We ſee the Church at firſt falling under perſecutions, and* all of them ſcattered abroad, *but ſome few that held together privately at* Jeruſalem, Act. 8. 1. *and* cap. 11. 19. *and in the next Chap. we ſee their meetings were very cloſe and ſecret,* cap. 12. 12, 13. *And ſo was it often with the Church, during the perſecutions of the firſt* 300 *years, often put to have their meetings before day, and in caves, or ſecret places; yet ſo they maintained the Communion and being of the Church. Why then ſhould any think it ſtrange to ſee the like diſturbance of peace and order happen to a* National *Church? But to come yet nearer our Caſe; When the Church under the violence of Arrian Emperours was perſecuted, ſcattered, Biſhops driven from their Sees, and all good Chriſtian people* (*that would not communi-*

cate

cate with Hereſie and Schiſm) driven from the publick places of Worſhip, & put to meet as they could, and where they could; yet ſo they continued the Cõmunion of the Church.

Now during thoſe perilous times, there was nothing done in the Way of the Church, for Worſhip or Diſcipline, but tis or may be done in this Church. And if any can ſay, tis not ſo done, he does but ſpeak the neceſſity of Times, or at worſt but the fault & failings of men, not the want of any thing neceſſary in the Conſtitution of this Church. For notwithſtanding the attempts of violence, there is the ſame Doctrine and power of Diſcipline remaining, the ſame Liturgie and form of worſhip, the ſame Government by Biſhops and other inferiour Paſtors; and were there the ſame Zeal, as was in the Chriſtians of the Antient Church under the Heathen or Arrian violence, there would be no cauſe of complaint, no occaſion of reproach, as there is now with ſome by reaſon of Communion and Diſcipline, not yet ſo regularly provided for in the preſent diſturbed condition of this Church.

Indeed this may be ſaid towards an excuſe, that ſuch has been the Conjuncture of Affairs for theſe laſt years, ſuch the uncertainty of Occurrences in relation to Church

and

and State, that it made the Times very difficult for those that had lawfull power to know, or resolve how to use it lawfully, and to the best advantage. The Windes in this storm have blown so contrary and from such several quarters, and the Waves, which beat upon the Ship, have been so broken and uncertain, that it was hard for those that were at the Helm to stear, or bear up against them. And if our Pilots tired out with the storm, did think it best (as they did, Act. 27. 25.*) to* let the Ship drive *a while, out of hope the Winde would cease of it self, or some other more favourable blast arise from some other quarter: This indeed might be prudence for the then pressing Exigency; yet must not they or any else, because the storm lies still upon us, think (as they did,* Act. 27. 30.*)* of flying out of the Ship, *But rather take courage* after long abstinence, *and provide for safety as well as the difficulty and distresse of the Times will permit.*

There laid a heavy storm upon the Church, when it was under the Heathen, or Arrian violence; yet if compared with the condition of our Times, it will appear to have been in better capacity of holding the Communion more regular and distinct, by

reason

reaſon the oppoſition was more regular, certain, and apparent: The Civil power was the ſame, no alteration of State to trouble them, but only the will of the Prince changed, and for the time bent againſt them: the buſineſſe alſo of Religion was clear, and eaſie to reſolve, for, whether we conſider the Heathen Superſtition, or the Arrian Hereſie: both ſo apparent, that the temptations of compliance were leſſe forcible, and ſo the means of holding Chriſtians together, in a diſtinct Communion more ready and eaſie.

The condition of our Times hath indeed been more difficult, which though it might perſwade forbearance a while, and excuſe it: yet now it calls for the more courage and zeal, in providing for that which ſeems to have been too long neglected, (a more regular Church-way of Communion and worſhip) that which the Apoſtle calls for, and mindes the ſcattered Hebrews of, Not forſaking the aſſembling of our ſelves together, as the manner of ſome is, *Heb.* 10. ver. 25. *as the manner of too many among us is, who are either careleſſe of meeting at all for divine worſhip, or indifferent where or with whom they meet: nothing ſcrupling that* promiſcuous *Communion, which is yet*

ſeen

ſeen in too many places, and ſhould (I confeſſe) be provided againſt. If any ask how? how, but by the power of the Keyes, *which the Sword of violence cannot cut in ſunder, nor the Church looſe, unleſſe they that hold them, caſt them away? The uſe of that power is to ſeparate or* take forth the pretious from the vile, (Jer. 15. 19.) *the tender Sheep from the violent Goats, the peaceable Chriſtian from the factious Schiſmatick: And* he that is filthy let him be filthy ſtill, (Revel. 22.) *and he that will contemn, let him mock on ſtill, but God is not mocked. And were this done, as it might be done according to the preſent diſtreſs of theſe Times, there would be no occaſion for the Adverſaries to mock, or for other to complain (as the Prophet* Iſa. *in the behalf of* Jeruſalem, ch. 31. 18.) There is none to guide her of all the Sons whom ſhe hath brought forth, neither is there any that taketh her by the hand, of all the Sons that ſhe hath brought up. *But the Adverſaries* that have afflicted her, *and ſaid to her,* Bow down, that we may go over, *would for their mocking have cauſe to fear what the Lord threatens at the* 23 ver. I will put the cup of trembling into their hand.

And

And now Good Reader, if thou beest (or wouldst shew thy self) a good Church-man, that is a good Christian, abhorring Idols, *and hating to* commit Sacrilege, *desiring to keep thy self pure from Superstition in divine worship, and from Faction and Schism in Church-Communion*: Beware *then of false Teachers*, Beware of the Concision, (Phil. 3. 2.) *both New and Old*; *Suffer not thy self to be cut off from thy former Communion, either by any new Sect, or by the cunning of any* Romish *perswasion*: *Let not these troublesome Times, which are for thy tryall, and manifesting of what is approved in thee, be unto thee an occasion of falling. God, whom thou servest in the spirit, is able to make thee stand. To his grace I commend thee.*

HEN: FERNE.

Of the Diviſion between the Engliſh Church *and* Romiſh *upon the Reformation.*

IT cannot be denied, that every Chriſtian is bound to learn and know upon the beſt Evidence he can, what it is that God will have him believe to Salvation, and how he will be worſhipped by him. To this he ſtands obliged, both by the end of his hope, Salvation, if he will attain to that, and by his Vow, at his

his entrance into Christianity, the promise he made, *to Believe, and Doe all*, &c.

Now when differences are among Christians about Faith and Worship, we are more concerned to use care and diligence in seeking after the Truth: not to follow all Guides, or take all on Trust, but, as S. *Jude* bids us, *Earnestly to contend for the Faith once delivered*, Jude ver. 3.

Many years have we contended with the Church of *Rome* about the Faith once delivered, impleading her of innovating in Belief and Worship to the introducing of grosse Errors, and Superstitions: And still we have more cause to contend with them of that Church, because more busie now in working upon the distempers of the Times, and in drawing away some unwary and unstable Protestants, by plausible pretences of seeming advantage to the Romish Church,

Church, in comparison of the now disturbed condition of the Church of *England.*

Our work is therefore to strive with them, not out of the spirit of contention, to the multiplying of Controversies, or enlarging the Rent which (God knows) is too wide already: but only to the necessary defence of our selves, our Faith and Worship, of which we are alwaies ready to give an account. And as to the charging of them, however they deal with us, we are willing to excuse in them, what is excusable: Yet so as to make appear, what is deceitfull in their general plausible pretences, and what is hurtful or destructive to the Catholick Faith, in their particular Doctrines.

This is certain and not to be denied, that a Doctrine of Faith was delivered, the true Profession of which, makes or constitutes a Church:

Church: alſo that there is and will be, to the Worlds End, muſt not be taken as the Romaniſts doe, as if one and the ſame Church of one denomination, as *Roman*, or *Epheſian*, or *Engliſh*, ſhould doe it; or, as if thoſe Paſtors, which are chief in place ſhould doe it; but that it ſhall be done in ſome part or other of the Catholick Church, and by ſuch of the Paſtors in the Catholick Church, as it pleaſes God to uſe for the preſervation of his Truth: a Church, in which, and by which (as the Pillar of Truth) that doctrine ſhall be preſerved and upheld: and in that Church a ſucceſſion of Paſtors and Teachers to deliver down that Doctrine of Faith once delivered by our Lord and his Apoſtles.

The Romaniſt, when he is to contend for his faith, is not willing to come to the Trial of particular Doctrines, but rather ſtaies in the Generalls

rals of *a Church*, *a viſible ſucceſſion*, and the like, ſeeking by theſe (which make a plauſible noiſe to the Unwarie) to prove the continuation of the Doctrine rather, than to defend his Church by the Doctrine ſhe delivers; and to make a clamour of *Diviſion* and *Schiſme* (odious Names) rather than to examine upon due conſideration of that purity of Faith and Worſhip (which every Church ought to hold) where the cauſe is, and whoſe the fault, that we now ſtand divided.

Wee begin with the Generalls. Where, upon the ſeeming advantage of the former pretences, they charge us with ſetting up a New Church, when we reformed; and as conſequent to that, with Schiſme or breach of Communion. We deny that we ſet up a New Church, or made a Schiſme, or that we ſtand guilty of this breach of Communion.

Chap. I.

We ſet not up a new Church, but were the ſame Chriſtian Church before and after the Reformation.

IN order to the firſt, they uſually put the queſtion, *Where was your Church before* Luther? A Queſtion that carries a charge very plauſible to the unlearned, who cannot diſtinguiſh between the *face*, and the *body* (or rather *ſoul*) of a *Church*: between that which *makes a Church*, and that which *makes it ſuch a Church*. We anſwer therefore, our Church was there where now it is, and where it alwaies was; the ſame Chriſtian Church, as before the Reformation, having loſt nothing that made it ſo. But ſay they, *The Church in* England *before the Reformation was their Church, holding and practiſing what they did.* Be it ſo, that the Church of *England* generally held and practiſed ſo, yet may it remain the ſame *Chriſtian Church*, when it ceaſed to hold and practice ſo. For we may likewiſe put the Queſtion to them, *Where was your Church for divers Ages of the Primitive and firſt Times?* They will anſwer, *where it is now, at* Rome *and elſewhere.* But we ſay, *that was our Church, holding and practiſing (for the main) as we*

we. For *where was there for thoſe firſter Ages, a Romiſh Church holding and delivering the Canon of the Scripture, as they doe now? or pretending to an Infallibility, as now? or challenging Univerſal ſubjection, as now? where was there a Romiſh Church for* 500 *years, that held Purgatory a point of Faith? that taught Invocation of Saints for Catholick doctrine? or that practiſed it in the publick Liturgie for about that time? or that taught, or practiſed Image-worſhip for a longer time? or where was a Roman Church that taught and enjoyned Communion under one kinde, for a* 1000 *years?* This is moſt notorious to them, that are but reaſonably acquainted with Antiquity. Nor is Cardinal *Peron's* 18 *cap. lib.* 1. againſt the King, touching *the Agreement of the Antient and Modern Church,* any proof againſt it, but a flouriſh only. Now if they, notwithſtanding theſe and many other errors and corruptions by (degrees crept in upon that Church) will ſay, *Their Church is ſtill the ſame with the antient Roman Church,* they muſt give us leave to ſay with more reaſon: We, notwithſtanding we have caſt off thoſe corruptions, are the ſame Chriſtian Church; yea, and ſay it with more

truth and advantage, in as much as that which made the *Romiſh* or *Engliſh Church* beforethe Reformation to be a Church, we have retained, without the accrewing corruptions, and ſo much more like the Church which was at *Rome*, and in *England* in the firſt and purer Ages. We ſay therefore, we are the ſame Chriſtian Church, having loſt nothing that made us ſo, but only caſt off many things, that endangered our being ſo, *viz:* thoſe many errors & ſuperſtitions that tended to the deſtruction of that Chriſtian faith, which made us a Church. As a man recovered from ſome peſtilential or dangerous diſeaſe, is the ſame man that before, has loſt nothing that made him ſo, only now freed from the corruption, that endangered his being ſo. We ſet up then no *new Church*, but *reformed* that which was, *freeing* it from former *corruptions*. And this makes a *different Church*, but not a *New Church*; a different Church I ſay, according to *accidental* differences, by which the ſame body may differ from it ſelf at ſeveral times, and the parts of the ſame body from one another at the ſame time: ſo one Church may differ from it ſelf at ſeveral times, & from other Churches,

ches, yet they and it be parts of the Catholick Church; but not according to *Eſſential* differences, which conſtitute a *Church* as part of the *Catholick*, and make it differ from another, that is not ſo. The *Engliſh Church* differed from it ſelf as before and after Reformation, yet the ſame Chriſtian Church; only before it had a Romiſh face, and garb, and apparel ſuitable, and a body full of ſpots and ſores: After, it appeared otherwiſe, yet ſtill the ſame body, the ſame Church, not loſt any thing of that which made it ſo; but only caſt off acceſſory accidental corruptions.

For thus it ſtood between the Church of *Rome*, and the Church of *England*, before the Reformation. They were both parts of the Catholick Church, both built upon the ſame foundation, that Catholick Faith, which had been delivered down in all Ages: that into which they and we are Baptized into, (they not yet daring to baptize into any points of their new faith) that which they and we yet agree in, which makes them a Church, and part of the Catholick, becauſe they retaine that Faith ſtill, though clogged with many dangerous errors and ſuperſtitions in belief and practice. While the

Church of *England* was in Communion with them, it alſo admitted of many ſuperſtructures, Hay, ſtubble and worſe: Errors & ſuperſtitions, which by degrees crept upon the Foundation, and paſſe at this day in the Church of *Rome* (to the great abuſe of poor Chriſtian Souls) as Catholick Faith. The work of Reformation was to retain the foundation, and whatever was Chriſtian and Catholick, & only to throw off the ſuperſtructures, that burdened and ſhaked it.

Theſe errors and ſuperſtructures after they appeared, were complained of in all Ages, by many that ſtill held Communion with the Romiſh Church; and Hiſtory alſo aſſures us of many in ſeveral Ages, that did actually caſt them off, and ſuffered themſelves to be put out of the Romiſh Communion, rather than admit of them; and how many thouſands more muſt we ſuppoſe to have been not recorded, when 7000 were in *Iſrael*, not ſo much as known to *Eliah*? This we note, not as if wee were bound to ſeek the Church only in thoſe Reformers, which were of a divided communion from *Rome*, or to deny the Church to be in thoſe of the Romiſh Communion, but to ſhew, that

that however thoſe errors were for ſome Ages delivered, as Catholick Doctrine, by the greater and more prevailing party in that Church, yet were they not held for ſuch by many that continued in that communion, and rejected actually by many thouſands beſides.

Chap. II.

The demand of Profeſſors in all Ages. We can ſhew it better than they.

When therefore they call upon us to name Profeſſors of the Proteſtant faith in all Ages; though it belongs to them rather to ſhew the Profeſſors of their faith in all Ages, (their part being the affirmative, aſſerting what we deny) and it be a thing they are not able to doe for the five firſt and beſt ages (as was above inſinuated) yet we anſwer them: If by ſuch Profeſſors they mean thoſe that held a diſtinct communion from the Roman Church, it is not neceſſary to name ſuch, becauſe the faith was preſerved ſtill in that Communion, though with a great mixture of errors: yet after thoſe errors and corruptions grew to a height, we can

give examples in all Ages after, of ſuch Proteſtors againſt them, divided from the Romiſh Communion, and perſecuted becauſe of them; and more abundant examples happily of ſuch we might have had, but that little is come down to us of thoſe poor Chriſtians, beſide what hath come from or through the hands of their profeſſed Enemies. Now in thoſe examples we have ſo many inſtances, not of new Churches ſet up, but of the former reformed; and repreſentations of the Catholick Church in ſome part more pure, in ſome part (and that generally the greater) more unſound.

Firſt, it is not neceſſary, there ſhould be ſuch, ſo profeſſing in all points as we doe: For here is a latitude of Truth, and ſeveral degrees of Purity, within which God is pleaſed to preſerve his Church, as both Reaſon, and Experience, demonſtrate.

2. There might be ſuch ſo profeſſing, though not ſo viſible and known as to be recorded.

3. There were ſuch, ſo farre as the preſervation of Truth and purity in doctrine in ſuch a degree was neceſſary for the continuance and propagation of the Church:

Church: Elſe what could *Eliah* have ſaid, if he had been challenged to ſhew Profeſſors at that time within the Kingdome of *Iſrael?* or after, if they that held the true worſhip in King *Ahaz* his time had been challenged to ſhew them in the Church of *Iſrael* or *Judah?* for as to his point of preſervation of neceſſary Truth and due worſhip, there is no difference betwixt Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church, the continuance of Gods Church being as neceſſary before Chriſt as after. But we may ſee how the Romaniſts are fain to plead for their Faith and Religion by the uncertain Records of Hiſtory rather than by the known and confeſſed Writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles; yea, to hang all upon a negative Argument from the Records of Hiſtory, rather than to reſt upon that which is poſitively affirmed in Scripture; For thus runs their Argument. We doe not ſee this or that doctrine profeſſed in all Ages, therefore it cannot be Apoſtolical; whereas it is farre more ſafe to argue, This Doctrine or Religion we ſee is Apoſtolical, plainly delivered in Scripture, therefore it was profeſſed in all Ages; profeſſed I ſay, though not alwaies ſo numerouſly and

openly, as they expect; nor so fully as is by Protestants in all points asserted: yet at least so professed as was necessary to the preservation of *saving Tr[illegible]*, and continuance of the Church. Their negative Argument is farre more forcible against themselves, their Doctrines being Affirmatives, and they bound to shew them professed in all Ages: Whereas our difference from them being in the Negative of what they erroneously affirm, must needs suppose the Errors in being before there could be any Protestors against them; and render it a vain challenge, to shew Protestants, as Protestants in all Ages; when as many Ages passed before the Errors got head, against which they protested. And for those Ages in which the Errors prevailed: what if Histories have not recorded, what if Historians that wrote then, did not so much as know those who were free from such Errors? which is very possible, when *Eliah* knew not of any in his time, and yet there were 7000: what then becomes of their Faith, that make this their chief plea against Protestants?

But if by Professors in all Ages they mean such as dissented & complained of the

the prevailing Errors, though it be impossible there should be such in all Ages simply, because those errors were not at all for many Ages, yet such are found (as we said) in all Ages after the Error appeared; and how many more suppose we to have been, which are not recorded; or to have written against arising Errors in that Church, whose Writings are not come down to us?

The Church of *England*, when it pleased God more openly to discover the Errors, and to touch the spirits and consciences of Men, did accordingly cast them off? only the Church of *Rome* would neither acknowledge them to be such, nor amend any thing: but having for many Ages challenged Universall Jurisdiction over all other Churches, and prided her self, as the only Catholick Church, and Infallible Guide, she did withall render her self altogether incorrigible, without hope of reformation and amendment.

Chap. III.

How they and we are ſaid to differ in Eſſentials.

SOme Exceptions they make againſt this, that hath been ſaid. 1. From the expreſſion uſed by ſome Proteſtants, that we and the Church of *Rome* differ in *Eſſentials*; thence I have heard ſome of them make this fallacious argument. If differ in Eſſentials, then have the Proteſtants made a new Church eſſentially differing from that which was. *Anſw.* The fallacy is in the word *Eſſentials*, which is taken either properly, for Doctrines of Faith belonging to the conſtitution of the Eſſence or beeing of a Church, or improperly for ſuch as endanger it, working to the diſſolution of it, tending to the corruption, & deſtruction of the Eſſence and beeing of a Church: In this latter ſenſe the Doctrines of Error and Superſtition, wherein they differ from us, are termed *Eſſentials*, being no light matters, (as thoſe of Rites and Ceremony) but ſuch as concern the Eſſence or being of a Church: not *conſtitutivè* indeed, and in the affirmative (*i. e.*) not ſuch as are

to

to be held and aſſerted by every Church, but *deſtructivè* rather, and in the negative, that is, ſuch as are to be denied and avoided by every Church, as it tenders its own beeing and preſervation. Even as a man, that is in company with infected perſons, is concerned, as he tenders his life, to avoid the contagion, or to free himſelf from it, if tainted; So ſtill the difference of this Church from what it was under the Papacy, is as of the ſame body once infected, now ſound, once diſeaſed, now recovered.

The Church of the *Galatians* was farre gone in the way of the *Moſaical Law* to the endangering of the Goſpel, inſomuch that Saint *Paul* ſaith in a manner they were removed to another Goſpel, *Gal.*1.6. and that he was afraid of them, *cap.*4.11. The Churches of *Pergamus* and *Thyatira* were ſo far corrupted, that Satan is ſaid to have his ſeat there, *Rev.* 2. 13. and thoſe that taught the doctrine of *Balaam*, and thoſe that held the doctrine of the *Nicolaitans*, *v.*14,15. And *Jezabel* was ſuffered to teach in *Thyatira*, and to ſeduce the ſervants of God, *ver.*20. Now when theſe Churches were reformed, the ſeducing Teachers and falſe doctrines caſt

caſt out, were they New Churches ſet up? or could thoſe that ſtill adhered to the Law, or new Goſpel in *Galatia*, or to the falſe doctrines in *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*, challenge the reformed party of Novelty? ſo was it with this Church before and after the Reformation, having parted with nothing, that belonged to the *beeing* of a Church, or to the *Faith once delivered*, but onely caſt out thoſe falſe doctrines that had ſo generally prevailed in it, while it was in communion with the Roman Church.

2. They object, We caſt not off Errors or Superſtitions, but the true Catholick Faith. *Anſw.* Indeed it concerns them to make the World believe (if they can) that their New Faith was alwaies Catholick, and that we for denying it are Hereticks. But the clearing of this belongs to the examination of the particular doctrines.

Chap. IV.

Particular Churches may reform; Eſpecially when a General Councel cannot be expected.

3. THey ask what Authority we had to reform the Church, and tell us, we ſhould have expected the determination of a General Councel, and not been Judges in our own Cauſe. *Anſ.* We took not upon us to reform the Church, but had a neceſſity and duty upon us to reform our ſelves. Neither did we undertake to impoſe upon other Churches, but purge our own. And as we were a *party* in the *cauſe*, ſo was the *Pope* and his *faction*; and as we would not have been Judges in this *cauſe*, could we had a *competent Judge*, ſo was *not* he with *his faction* fit to be a *Judge* in the *cauſe*. Indeed a *lawful* and *free General Councel* of the *whole Church*, ſetting *ſcripture* before them as their *Rule*, had been the only and *competent Judge*; but ſeeing ſuch a *Councel* was not to be had, or expected, (not a *General* one, becauſe of the *diviſion* of the *Eaſtern Church* from the *Weſt*, nor a *lawful* and *free* one, becauſe of the exorbitant power of the Pope and his Dependants) it remained we ſhould uſe

uſe the means left us, and doe it by Provincial and National Synods, keeping the ſame Rule, the Word of God, Which *Gerſon* with other wiſe learned men allows, and calls it *reformari per partes*; when the Church reforms it ſelf by parts; and to this, provincial Councels doe ſuffice, *Gerſ: de Concil: Unius obed:*

And ſo we reade, the Emperour with other Kings and Princes, who called for a General Councel to compoſe differences in Religion, thought it reaſonable upon the tergiverſation of the Pope, to doe it by Provincial Synods in their ſeveral Dominions, and ſo they threatned the Pope they would do, if he would not conſent to a Councel. A Councel, and the name of Reformation were alwaies formidable to the Court of *Rome*, and between the dread of a General Councel, and the fear of ſuch Provincial Synods, Pope after Pope hung tormented for divers yeares, uſing all the artifices as might be, to ſatisfie the Princes, and yet to keep off both General and Provincial Synods; till Pope *Paul* the third aroſe, a man of Spirit, and cunning, who turned the fear of a Councel into the hope and expectation of advantage by it; And ſo

indeed

indeed he and his dependants ordered the buſineſſe at *Trent*, that nothing could there be determined without his privity and direction; that in the end both Princes and People, inſtead of relief, they expected by a Free Councel, found themſelves more hampered and enſlaved by the pretended General Councel of *Trent*. Where divers points, which before were more free to opine in, or have freedome of opinion in, were defined Articles of Faith, and all hope excluded of gaining what divers Princes made no queſtion to carry at the beginning, *viz.* Communion in both kindes, Prieſts marriage, Service in a known tongue, and ſome other.

The Princes and the People were very ill ſatisfied with this dealing; the *French* did not of many years receive that Councel, yet did not proceed to make uſe of a national Synod (happily becauſe of the troubles in that Kingdome) but the *Engliſh* Nation would not be ſo fooled; for ſeeing aforehand what could be expected from the Court of *Rome*, they made uſe of that Power, which God has left in every Church of judging for it ſelf according to his word: eſpecially when the Catholick Church ſtands ſo divided and oppreſ-

ſed

sed with faction, that the chief remedy of all, a Free General Councel, cannot be had.

What God spake to his people by the Prophet *Hos.* 4.15. *Though Israel transgresse, yet let not Judah sin,* tells us, a particular Church may and ought to reform, though others will not; and the examples of many Provincial Councels in this point of declaring, and casting out errors, creeping upon them, warrant what we have done. For if Saint *Augustine* and the other Bishops in a Provincial Synod declared against, and rejected the usurped claim of the Pope in point of Appeal, why might not the English Church under *Henry* the VIIIth. cast out his usurped power here? And if the Provincial Synod of *Laodicea* declared against, and condemned the worshipping of Angels then on foot, why might not we also declare against worship of Saints and Images prevailing here?

If it be said, it was not done here by a just Provincial Synod, but the most of the former Bishops were against the Reformation, and displaced. *Answ.* We need not tell them how the business was carried at *Trent*, how some were sent away,

some-

some kept back, others, and they but Titular Bishops, sent in; and all to make up a *major* part; which the Histories of that Councel witness. And *Dudithius* an Hungarian Bishop, and one of the Orators for that King, complained of it, as it is to be seen in his advices and Letters from thence. But we say, that in that Reformation under *Henry* the VIII:th. and Queen *Elizabeth* is more largely pursued in my Ist Part, *Chap:* 2. there was no displacing of Bishops, but all passed with a general consent. And upon that Reformation or Ejection of the Popes usurped power, arose the first division of the English and Romish Church. In that which followed under Queen *Elizabeth*, the businesse of the Synod was regularly carried by the Major part; the displacing of the Bishops, that were put out, being before, and that upon the denyal of the Oath of Supremacy, and their conspiring together to refuse to Crown the Queen. I will conclude this point of our Reforming with the saying of Saint *Cyprian*, lib. 2. Ep:3. *Si quis de Anteceſſorib: &c. If any of those that went before us did through ignorance, or simplicity not observe and hold this, which the Lord by his example and doctrine*

doctrine hath taught, it may be pardoned them through the Indulgence of God; Nobis non poterit ignoſci, &c. *but to us it cannot be pardoned, who are now admoniſhed and inſtructed of the Lord.* So ſay we, If any went before us in the Communion and Errors of the *Roman Church*, through ſimplicity of heart, we deny him not mercy with God; but we could not expect it, if being better inſtructed of God we had not amended our known errors.

Chap. V.

We not guilty of Schiſm. The guilt of the breach lies on the Romaniſts.

THus farre of our *Reforming*, Now of that which followed upon it, *breach of Communion*. And here they charge us with Schiſme. When I ſay breach of Communion followed upon our Reforming, I doe not take the charge and guilt of it upon us, or imply that it followed as the proper effect does upon the immediate cauſe; but followed accidentally, occaſionally, and is to be imputed to ſome cauſe elſe; not our reforming, but their default. They gave us cauſe by Errours and

and Superſtitions thruſt upon us, to reform; They, when We and all Nations called for Reformation, remained incorrigible; We did our duty, they would not doe theirs; Diviſion of Communion neceſſarily followes (by reaſon thoſe Errours were not only in belief, but in practice and worſhip too) not upon our leaving the Errours, but upon their not leaving them; not upon our going forward, but becauſe they would not come on: As when communicating of Infants, was believed as neceſſary, and accordingly practiſed through the Catholick Church, we muſt underſtand it, as generally believed and practiſed, or more generally, than was any Romiſh Errour before the Reformation for many ages, that National Church, which firſt reformed it ſelf in that belief and practice, did it juſtly without expecting a General Councel, and as to that belief and practice ſtood divided from other National Churches or parts of the Catholick, till they ſhould reform too; indeed there followed no breach or diviſion upon it, becauſe they all reformed.

That ſaying of S. *Auguſtine* ſo much in the Mouthes of Papiſts, *Nulla neceſſitas*,

tas, &c. *there is no neceſſity of dividing from the Church*, was true many waies, but no way againſt us.

1. True in regard of the occaſion upon which it was ſpoken, *viz:* the ill lives of many in the Church; no neceſſity of dividing or leaving Communion for that.

2. In regard of the Perſons againſt whom it was ſpoken, *viz:* the Donatiſts; they had no neceſſity, or juſt cauſe of leaving the Church.

3. In regard of the Catholick Church; there is no neceſſity of dividing from that, for they that divide from the Catholick Church, doe break with it either upon the point of Faith or Charity, *i. e.* they either depart from that one Faith held in the Catholick Church; or holding that Faith, doe break with it for ſome cauſe or matter externall to that one Faith, and for it uncharitably condemn all others, as not belonging to the Catholick Church. So did the Donatiſts. We did neither. For our ceaſing to communicate with the Roman Church (which yet is but a particular, not the Catholick Church) was upon the preſerving and keeping entire that Catholick Faith once delivered, which being the chief bond

of

of Unity of the Catholick Church, and being by us preſerved together with the bond of Charity in not condemning them, as no part of the Catholick Church, we cannot be therefore ſaid to divide from the Communion of the Catholick Church; or to be cauſe of that Diviſion, which followed upon our endevouring to preſerve that Faith entire; but they are the cauſe of it, that would not, and yet would condemn us.

Our defence then in generall ſtands thus. We had juſt cauſe to reform, and ſo had they; We in Reforming did what we ought: if they had done what they ought, and had cauſe to doe, no breach or diviſion had followed. And further, We in doing what we ought, preſerved the Faith entire, together with Charity. They would neither caſt off their Errors, which clogged and corrupted the Faith, nor retain Charity; but cut us off (as much as in them) from the Catholick Church. It is clear then to whom the Cauſe of this Diviſion muſt be imputed.

Chap. VI.

How neceſſity of dividing Communion ariſes.

But that it may more particularly be underſtood, what we did, and what cauſe or neceſſity we had of ſo doing: We muſt conſider, that the neceſſity of abſtaining from the Communion of this or that Church, does not preſently ariſe upon Errours or Superſtitions ſuffered or taught in that Church, and held or practiſed by many in it: No, though they be groſſe Errours, and may be damnable to them, that careleſly ſuffer themſelves to be ſeduced into them. Such were the ſeducing doctrines ſuffered and taught in the Churches of *Galatia*, *Pergamus*, and *Thyatira* (Chap. 3. as aboveſaid) yet was not any therefore neceſſitated to divide from their Communion.

But then the neceſſity ariſes, 1. When the Errour is directly Fundamental, as in the *Arian* hereſie; for which all true Catholicks held themſelves obliged to abſtain from their Communion. We doe not charge the Roman Church upon that ſcore, in the cauſe of this diviſion.

2. When

2. When the Errour and *Superſtition* is in the practiſe, that concerns the adminiſtration of the Sacraments, the publick ſervice, the Form and Worſhip (in all which ſtands the exerciſe of the external Communion) ſo that men, truly informed and convinced of thoſe Errours and Superſtitions, cannot communicate with good conſcience, there ariſes a neceſſity of abſtaining from ſuch practiſe, and conſequently from Communion with that Church, ſo far as to ſuch practiſes, yet ſo as holding it a part of the Catholike Church. This, I ſay, is a dividing from ſuch a Church in the external Communion, by ceaſing to practiſe and hold ſome things, which it doth, but a joyning with it in the Catholike, of which we hold it ſtill a part, as we alſo are. And this may give ſenſe to that diſtinction, of forſaking the Errors, but not the Church, *i.e.* not forſaking, or caſting off that which makes a true Member of the Church, or not breaking with the Church upon the point of true Faith or Charity.

3. When ſuch Superſtitious practiſes, together with Errours in belief (in themſelves groſs and palpable, and to the careleſſe or wilfull, damnable) are not onely

taught and permitted in a Church, but impoſed alſo, and required, as a condition of Communion (ſo that they which ſhall not ſo profeſſe, or practiſe, are ſentenced as Hereticks, and excommunicated) there is juſt cauſe and neceſſity of dividing from the Communion of ſuch a Church.

Now in both theſe reſpects we charge the Church of *Rome* with the cauſe of our Diviſion, and that we were thereupon neceſſitated to abſtain from her Communion, yet ſo as holding her then, and ſtill a Church; and being then, and ſtill ready to hold Communion with her: Saving the duty of true Members of the Catholike Church, in caſe ſhe would provide for the ſecurity thereof by a tolerable Reformation.

So our defence ſtands upon theſe two Aſſertions. That ſuch a cauſe is juſt and neceſſary: and that the Church of *Rome* gave it, and we had it; which two make up the two Propoſitions of this Argument. It is lawfull to abſtain from the Communion of that Church, which requires unlawfull and ſinfull conditions of her Communion; but the Church of *Rome* requires ſuch. Or thus. All men ought upon true conviction to forſake their

their known Errours and ſins; but we knew them, and were truly convinced of them, therefore in forſaking them we did what we ought.

The firſt propoſition in both theſe forms ſtands as undeniable, or elſe it muſt be granted, that we may be bound to continue under a neceſſity of ſinning, and that knowingly. So the whole buſineſſe reſts upon the ſecond propoſition, that ſuch was our Caſe, and ſuch the Cauſe that the Church of *Rome* gave; which muſt appear by examination of the particular doctrines of Belief and Practiſe, enjoyned all the members of that Church.

Now that they containe ſuch Errours and Superſtitions, as before mentioned, we are ready to demonſtrate both by Scripture and the beſt Antiquity. But it is our purpoſe and work in preſent, to diſcover and take away the general pretences and plauſible allegations they make for themſelves, or againſt us in this Cauſe.

Chap. VII.

Sectaries cannot make the Plea that we doe.

AGainſt our Defence ſo ſtated, they uſually reply; If Proteſtants upon Apprehenſion, or conviction of Errours and Superſtitions in the Church of *Rome* had juſt cauſe to forſake her Communion, then may Sectaries juſtly forſake the Communion of the Proteſtants Church. For they alſo ſay, and are many times perſwaded and convinced, that *that* Church impoſes on them ſuch Errours.

Anſwer. Set the Termes aright, and the fallacy, or ambiguity of this captious reaſoning will appear. If by our apprehenſion or conviction of Errours in the Church of *Rome*, they mean onely our ſaying, pretending or thinking to be ſo: then the conſequence is good (for Sectaries doe pretend they are convinced, and many times verily think ſo) but the aſſumption then is falſe; for we did not upon ſuch bare apprehenſion or deceiving perſwaſion forſake the Communion of that Church; but upon a true and evident conviction of known Errours and Sins

Sins (which we were bound to commit in that Communion) demonſtrable by Scripture and Antiquity. Which conviction Sectaries have not; nor doe they at all pretend to confirme, what they ſay, by the practice of Antiquity. Make the Caſe like, and it will follow alike in both; If we had given them the like cauſe, as the Church of *Rome* gave us, they might alſo forſake our Communion: If they had the like conviction as we had, they might as juſtly doe the like. But ſeeing the caſe is unlike, both in regard of our giving them cauſe, and of their apprehenſion or conviction, it will not follow they can have juſt cauſe of Diviſion or Revolt. See of this more below, *Chap.* 13.

It is not then their ſaying or thinking, that we impoſed ſinfull conditions of Communion, and that they are convinced of it, which will juſtifie them, or prejudice us. For ſome mens miſtaking of Errour for Truth, muſt not make other men give over to ſtand to truth, and plead it againſt Errour; or perſwade them, they are alſo miſtaken, and cannot know the Truth when they doe know it evidently.

Heretikes of old (as * appears by Saint *Iren. Tertul.* and *Auguſt.*) * *vide cap.* 23. *propoſitum.*

ſheltered themſelves againſt Scripture by plea of Traditions: Now does the Church of *Rome* think it unreaſonable to defend it ſelf by unwritten Traditions, becauſe Heretikes pretended them? And yet I hope its more poſſible for us to make appear the truth of what we ſay, by that which is written in Scripture and Fathers, than for the Church of *Rome* to make the truth of what ſhe ſaies to appear by unwritten Traditions: the truth of which Traditions it is not poſſible for her to make appear.

It is not therefore ſaying or thinking, that muſt carry it on any ſide, but the evidencing and proving of what is ſaid. That we undertake to doe from point to point: as the clear demonſtration, that we had juſt cauſe, and were truly convinced of it, and had rebelled againſt Light, and grievouſly ſinned, had we ſtill continued in known Errour, and wilfull Sin: the inſeparable condition of Roman Communion, to them that have means to know the Errour and Sin.

But they object alſo, That the way of our Reforming, and Dividing from the Church of *Rome*, and the plea we make for it, leaves men to their own reaſon and judge-

judgement to make uſe of it againſt the Church, and ſo opens a gap to Hereſie and Schiſm.

Anſwer. It is not any thing we have done, or yet hold, that gives them juſt cauſe to object this to us; but the challenging of Infallibility to their Church, neceſſitates them to lay ſuch a charg upon all that will not blindly reſign up reaſon, judgement and faith to the dictates of their Church. We will firſt ſpeak of the uſe of Reaſon and Judgement permitted to them that can uſe it; then of the uſing it againſt, or diſſenting from the Church.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the uſe of Reaſon and Judgement in private men.

REaſon and Underſtanding is that Light, which he, *that lightens every man that comes into the World, Ioh.*1.9. puts into the mind of man to ſee, and judge thereby, what to believe, and what to doe. Now though we leave not men wholly to their own Reaſon, yet muſt we leave them the uſe of it, ſo far as is ne-

ceſſary to the aſſent, which Faith requires; and we leave it them, not in oppoſition to the publick Judgement of the Church, but to the blind obedience of an implicite Faith, that ſees no other ground or motive of believing and practiſing, than becauſe the Church ſo commands. If the Church of *Rome* impoſe the hard condition on them that come over to her (as *Nahaſh* the *Ammonite* on them of *Iabeſh Gilead*, that would come out to him, 1 *Sa.* 11.2.) to thruſt out their right Eye, the Eye of their ſpiritual underſtanding (by which they diſcern and judge of *Spiritual things revealed of God*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 13, 15.) and onely leave them the eye of common ſenſe to diſcerne what it is the Church doth practiſe, or what it defines, without further enquiring about the will of God, how conſonant that practiſe or definition, that worſhip or belief is to it. If, I ſay, ſhe can impoſe this hard condition, we cannot; but muſt ſay:

1. That no man can believe any thing truly with ſuch a free and full aſſent as faith requires, nor doe any thing in worſhip or practiſe of life, with that faith or due perſwaſion of the lawfulneſſe of it, which the Apoſtle requires *Rom.* 14. *ult.* unleſſe

unleſſe he be convinced of it in his judgement, as in the ſame *chap.v.5. Let every one be fully perſwaded in his own mind:* concluding by the due uſe of his reaſon, that its Gods revealed will he ſhould ſo doe and believe. For the Apoſtle ſpeaking that of perſwaſion in and about things indifferent, ſhews it is much more neceſſary in matters of Faith and Worſhip. Nor can this be eluded by ſaying, It is ſufficient for ſuch a perſwaſion, that a man knows the Church ſaith ſo, & thereupon concludes that God ſaith ſo; for there is more in the Apoſtles ſaying, *The Spiritual man judgeth all things*, 1 *Cor.*2. 15. For that *judging* is not a receiving of things propounded by the Church, without examination, but implies a diſcerning of them to be the things of God, before he receives them for ſuch by true faith; and the laſt reſolution or ſtay of Faith is not upon the Churches ſaying ſo.

2. Gods people are not left to themſelves to ſeeke out that revealed Will of God; but he has appointed Guides and Paſtors in his Church, in every National Church to propound and demonſtrate that Will of God out of his Word. To this end were *Paſtors and Teachers* given,

Eph. 4. *that we ſhould not be carried away with every wind of doctrine*, ver. 14.

Theſe have *publike judgement* to determine and judge for others, for they muſt give account for others; but private Chriſtians have their *private judgement*, or, *judgement of Diſcretion* for themſelves onely, which is in the diſcerning and receiving to themſelves, as the will of God, what is delivered, and propounded to them for they muſt anſwer alſo for themſelves, and live by their own faith; which cannot be without allowing them due uſe of their reaſon and judgement, to ſee the evidence of that to which they muſt aſſent. Therefore we ſay alſo, the Guides and Paſtors of the Church doe guide and teach not Infallibly, but Morally, by way of doctrine and perſwaſion, *by manifeſtation of the Truth, commending themſelves to every mans conſcience*, as *Paul* ſaith, 2 *Cor.* 4. 2.

3. When that is done, They doe not leave men to themſelves, but as Governours of the Church doe by power of the Keyes judge and bind the Gainſayers, and caſt the Refractory out of their Communion. So then the Guides of the Church have the *power of Publike Judgement*, to judge

judge and define for others in matters of faith and worſhip; and *power of Iuriſdiction*, to judge, cenſure, and caſt out the diſobedient; and to private men is leſt onely the *Iudgement of diſcretion*, without which they cannot come to beleeve, or ſerve God, as they ought, with *reaſonable ſervice*, Rom. 12.1.

CHAP. IX.

Of diſſenting from the publike Iudgement.

NOw for the uſing their reaſon and judgement againſt the Church, or their diſſenting from the definitions and practiſe of it, we give no encouragement to that.

We 1. teach all Inferiours, whether People or Prieſts, when they finde cauſe of doubt or queſtion againſt ſuch definitions or practiſe, to miſtruſt their owne reaſon, and rather relye upon the publick Judgment than their own in every doubtfull caſe.

2. That they which doubt ſtill ſeek reſolution and ſatisfaction from their Superiours, modeſtly propoundiug their doubts

doubts and reaſons, and conſcionably uſing all means to rectifie their judgment, and ſatisfie their Conſcience.

3. If they cannot find ſatisfaction ſo, as inwardly to acquieſce, yet to yeeld external obedience, & peaceable ſubjection, according as the condition of the matter queſtioned will bear. In a word, we require all that ſubmiſſion of judgement and outward compliance that may be due to an Authority, not infallible, yet guiding others by an infallible Rule, and moſt highly concerned to guide them accordingly, as being anſwerable for their Soules.

4. We tell them the danger of gainſaying, that they are to anſwer it to God and his Church; That if they cannot approve the reaſon of their diſſenting, to the judgement of the Church, they muſt expect to undergoe the Cenſures of it. For the Church ſtanding ſo obliged to anſwer for Souls, and to preſerve Peace and Unity, and having therefore the advantage of *Authority and publick judgement* above all private perſons, it is alſo moſt reaſonable it ſhould have the advantage, in the conteſtation with private perſons, and in the iſſue of ſuch a buſi-

neſſe,

neſſe, to proceed according to its own judgement, and uſe the power it has, againſt thoſe that ſtand out; And then is there a further anſwering it to God.

Thus it ſtands between every Particular Church, and the Members of it, betweene Superiours and Inferiours in it: and in ſome proportion between every particular or National Church and the Catholick Church, in receiving and holding the Definitions of Generall Councils, and the Generall Practiſe of the Church. Though here a Nationall Church hath the advantage above private perſons, in the point of Judgement and diſſenting. Yet where it does diſſent from other Churches generally erring, it ariſes firſt from the uſe of reaſon and judgement in private perſons, diſcovering the errours (for ſome in all Reformations muſt ſpeak firſt) and propounding them; which being approved by the Judgement of that Church, the Reformation follows as an Act of publick Judgement, or as an Act of a National Church, which though inferiour to the Catholick, yet hath it judgement within it ſelfe for the receiving and holding the Definitions and Practiſes of the Church-Generall, and

and may have poſſibly juſt cauſe of diſſenting and reforming; and can doe it regularly, according to the way of the Church by Provinciall Synods, which private perſons diſſenting from her cannot doe. And this is conſiderable in the Engliſh Reformation, which as it was upon publick Judgement of a Nationall Church in Provinciall Synods, ſo will it not prove a diſſenting from the Catholike Church, or definit ons of true Generall Councils; but of that more below, when we come to triall by Antiquity: And of this reſpect or ſubmiſſion due from every Particular Church to the General, as it concernes the Act of this Nationall Church in the Reformation, more largely in the firſt Chapter of my later Book. For the preſent we are to ſpeak of the poſſibility of diſſent of Inferiours from Superiours, and the uſe of reaſon and judgement neceſſary to it.

CHAP.

Chap. X.

Poſſibility of juſt diſſenting.

THe ſubmiſſion and obedience ſpoken of as due to Superiours, and their Judgement, ought to take place in all caſes, where there is not ſomething clearly againſt them, that confeſſedly excels the Authority and Judgement of the preſent Governours: as evidence of Scripture, demonſtration of reaſon, and a conformable conſent of Primitive Times, the pure Ages of the Church.

Now that ſuch a caſe, or ſuch a cauſe of uſing private judgement even to a diſſenting from the publike, may happen, Reaſon and Experience tells us. Becauſe it is poſſible, that ſuch as have chief place in the publike Judgement (National or General) may neglect their duty (at leaſt the greater number of them to the overbearing of the leſſe) and through prejudice of Faction, or other worldly reſpects, may faile in determining and propounding the Truth. (For the promiſe of guiding them is conditional upon performing duty, and that is not alwaies certaine in the greater part) to the im-

poſing

poſing of falſe Belief, and falſe Worſhip? So that it comes to be *Error manifeſtus*, appearing ſo to be, both by the Word of God, and the conformable beliefe and practiſe of the firſter Ages of the Church. Here is place for Reaſon and Judgement of Inferiours to diſſent upon ſuch Evidence, after modeſt propoſall, and demonſtration of the Errour. And to this in part accords the conceſſion of *Bell. lib. 2. de Concil.* Inferiours may not judge, whether their Superiours have lawfully proceeded, *niſi manifeſtiſſimè conſtet intolerabilem errorem committi.*

Now whēn I ſpeak of private Judgement diſſenting from the publick Judgement, or generall practiſes of the Church, and of the preſervation of Truth, and the Faith thereby, I doe not ſpeak of the Reaſon or Judgement of the People or Laity divided from all their Guides and Paſtors, but I include theſe; who (of what ranke ſoever) diſſenting from the publick, either definition or practiſe, are as men of private judgement in ſuch a caſe. Theſe, I ſay, I alwayes include in ſuch a juſt diſſenting or falling off from any erroneous belief or practiſe prevailing in the Church. For it cannot be imagined,

gined that God, who promiſed to be with them, and guide them, ſhould take away his Truth from all the Guides and Paſtors of his Church, and preſerve it by the Judgement and Conſcience of Lay people; but that ſtill, however they which have chiefe place in the Church prove corrupt, ſome Guides and Paſtors (though of leſſe number and place) ſhall be they that ſhall detect the prevailing Errours, and preſerve the Truth: and this by due uſe of Reaſon and private Judgement. Experience alſo tels us, what they have proved that have been in chiefe place; that have ſate in *Moſes* Chair, and in St. *Peters*; how many Hereticks at ſeverall times among the Popes; how a whole ſucceſſion of Monſters through the tenth Age; of which *Bellarmine* complaines, and *Baronius* cryes out, *Quæ facies Rom. Eccleſiæ!* when infamous Strumpets diſpoſed of Biſhopricks, yea thruſt their Paramours (*Amaſios ſuos*) into *Peters* Chaire! What Cardinals then made? what Biſhops then ordained by ſuch Monſters? and *ſtertentibus omnibus*, *all in a manner being aſleep*,——So he. Experience alſo tels us how groſſe Errours have prevailed over the Church: as for example,

example: The *Millenary* belief ſo generally, that *Juſtine Martyr* (*contra Tryph.*) ſaith, All that were in all points, or throughly Orthodox Chriſtians held it. So alſo the giving of the Communion to Infants after Baptiſm, as neceſſary to their ſalvation, generally held and practiſed in the whole Church for many Ages. I mean more generally than the Romiſh errors have been.

Now if there were not place for diſſenting by the uſe of private judgement (for ſome one perſon muſt ſpeake firſt in the diſcovering ſuch Errours) there would be a neceſſity of the Churches continuing in Errour. But both thoſe Errours were reformed; and he that ſpake firſt in diſcovering the untruth of them, did it upon the uſe of his private judgement, examining the beliefe and practiſe of the Church, & ſhewing the error of it.

It may be they will ſay, thoſe two Doctrines were not defined by the Church, *i. e.* by any General Council. So indeed they often excuſe their own Doctors, when they ſet their private judgement againſt the generall ſtreame of Antiquity: and by the like equity they might receive our plea; That the beliefe and practiſes

we

we forſooke were not Doctrines defined by the Church, *i. e.* by any lawfull General Council.

But what if thoſe two had been defined? then no man (will they ſay) ought to have queſtioned them, or uſed his private judgement againſt them. But then muſt we ſay, if any thing be defined amiſs, the Church muſt continue in errour, and an after General Council cannot amend it. But if things before defined may be corrected or reverſed by the like Authority, how can it come about but by the diſcovering of the former errour, and that upon the uſe of private Judgement, examining the definitions, and ſhewing the error to the Church? And that which *Bellarmine* grants (as I ſaid a little before) *Niſi manifeſtiſſimè conſtet errorem intolerabilem committi*, ſuppoſes ſuch error may be committed and diſcovered. But how can this later come about, but upon the uſe of private Judgement in Inferiours? and while the *Council of Trent* was not received in *France*, was it not upon the uſe of their Judgement againſt that Council, which with the *Romaniſts* paſſeth for General? or how can Moderate Papiſts think the reception

ception of the Catholick Church to be the beſt confirmation of the Decrees of a Council, if not allow private Judgement in the examining and receiving them? And ſeeing a General Council hath its power from the diffuſive Catholick Church, of which it is the repreſentation, however the Definitions of it may have more form of Law, yet not more weight to preſſe the judgement or conſcience, than what is generally believed and practiſed through the whole Church, as that of Infant Communion was.

We therefore leave men no otherwiſe to their reaſon and judgement, than reaſon and neceſſity enforceth, no otherwiſe than Chriſt and his Apoſtles left them. Reaſon enforceth it (as we heard) both in regard of the Church, which cannot elſe be reformed from prevailing errours; and in regard of every particular Man, who is to give account of himſelf, is to be ſaved by his own Faith, and periſhes upon his own ſcore. They were not excuſed if ſeduced by their Prophets and Teachers, as *Iſa* 9.14, 15, 16. *The Leaders of this people cauſe them to erre, and they that are led are deſtroyed*—Alſo, *Head and Tail, ruſh, and branch*, both cut

off, and *Ezek.* 33.6, and 8 Thoſe that periſh through the Prophets default, *their blood* notwithſtanding *is on their own head.* Anſwerably, *Mat.* 15. 14. They are not excuſed that blindly follow their Leaders, *both fall into the ditch.* The Romaniſts reject this, as not applicable to the Guides of their Church, anſwering in effect as the Phariſees (who alſo had chief place in the Church) *are we alſo blind?* Joh. 9. and we may reply, as our Saviour did; *You ſay, We ſee, therefore your ſin remaineth*; therefore your blindneſſe is more incureable.

Again, our Saviour and his Apoſtles left men the uſe of their reaſon and judgment in diſcerning what is taught them in and by the Church: For they enjoyn the uſe of it as a duty; as when our Saviour bids, *Search the Scriptures*, Joh. 5.39. *And take heed how you hear*, Luk. 8. 18. *Beware of falſe Prophets, and by their fruits ye ſhall know them*, Mat. 7. 15. *And beware of the Leaven of the Phariſees*, Mat. 16. v. 11. that is, *their Doctrine*, ver. 12. Now ſet againſt this laſt place, that which our Saviour ſaith, *Mat.* 23.2. *The Scribes and Phariſees ſit in* Moſes *Chair, all therefore that they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and doe:*

doe: How can theſe be reconciled (*obſerve whatſoever they teach, and yet beware of the Leaven of their Doctrine*) without allowing the Judgement of diſcretion in the hearer? So the Apoſtle, *Gal.*1. forbids the receiving of any other Goſpel, though preacht from Heaven by an Angel. How ſhould the *Galatians* know a difference 'twixt the Goſpel and Faith once delivered, and any other new one, but by uſing Reaſon and Judgement? To the ſame purpoſe he bids, *Prove all things, hold faſt that which is good,* 1 Theſ.5.21. *Try the Spirit,* 1 Joh 4.1. The Romaniſts anſwer, that theſe Precepts of *Proving* and *Trying*, are ſpoken to the Guides of the People. We ſay, that is true, to them chiefly ſpoken, and yet to the People too: to the Guides and Paſtors in order to reforming and caſting out Errors prevailing, (in which reſpect we plead for uſe of Reaſon and Judgement to be allowed, not to the people ſo much, but to their guides) alſo in order to the keeping out Errours, which falſe Teachers would bring in, to the ſeducing of the people; for their Guides are to judge for them. But ſtill that *Proving* and *Trying*, that *taking heed* belongs alſo to the People, and implyes their

their uſe of Reaſon and Judgement, not in order to Reforming or Judging for others, but in order to their own believing, or receiving what is taught & propounded to them. The Apoſtle calls to them, *Iudge what I ſay*, 1 Cor. 10. 15. *And judge in your ſelves*, 1 Cor. 11. *And the ſpiritual man judgeth all things*, 1 Cor. 2. 15. He ſpeakes of things taught in the Church, and of the Spiritual mans judging them, in order to his own beleeving; to which purpoſe, Saint *Ioh.* 1. *Ep.* 2. 27. *The Anointing ſhall teach you all things*, viz. ſo as to underſtand all things neceſſary to their Salvation.

Chap. XI.

How far the Romaniſts leave men the uſe of their Reaſon and Judgement.

SEE we now what uſe of Reaſon and Judgement the Romaniſts allow to Men. They ſpeake to the Reaſon and Judgement of Men, whom they would bring in unto them, uſe Motives and Arguments to perſwade their Religion, and the Authority of the Church of *Rome*. But if they ſuffer themſelves to be perſwaded,

ſwaded to embrace that Authority upon ſuch Reaſons and Motives, they muſt then reſigne up their Reaſon and Judgement wholly. Thus have they leave to uſe their ſight in finding out that Church, but when they have found it, then they muſt follow it blindfold, or looke but one way, that way onely that that ſhe directs, and take all upon truſt of her Infallible guidance. They will ſay they commend the Definitions of the Church to the judgement and conſciences of the people, alleadging Reaſons, and Teſtimonies from the Scriptures and Fathers; and this in order to better perſwaſion; ſo far it is well. But then their Reaſon and Judgement is abſolutely bound to look that way onely, and to ſee nothing againſt the definition of the Church: No, though ſhe defines it is not againſt Chriſts inſtitution to allow the people the Sacrament but in one kind: or that it is lawfull to adore Images, as ſhe has done in her Council of *Trent*. A man had as good ſpare his labour in uſing his Reaſon and Judgement to examine their proofs, as having done all, to be abſolutely concluded and bound up. Which no queſtion goes very hard with many of their more learned

learned Men, who ſee more reaſon and evidence againſt, than for what they are bound by the Church to believe and practice; and ſo are ground between the Definition of their Church, and the Judgement of their Conſcience, as between the upper and nether Milſtone. Hence that conſcionable cunning of the *Belgick Inquiſitours*, who in their *Index Expurgatorius*, 1571. confeſſe, when they meet with the Antients ſpeaking otherwiſe than their Church, *quovis commento*—they uſe any ſhift to remedy it.

We read how it fared with ſome Divines in the Council of *Trent*. Who (while their Articles were under deliberation undefined) honeſtly propoſing their doubts and arguments againſt the cõmon ſenſe of the prevailing party, were cryed out on as *Lutherans*; and ſome of them not ſuffered to ſpeak more, were ſent away: ſo free was that Council! What ſhall we think now after the definitions are made, but that mens Conſciences, judgements, tongues are bound up, not to doubt, think, or modeſtly propound any thing againſt them without the note of *Hereſie*, and danger of the *Inquiſition*?

But ſee we what follows upon their Conceſſions: To finde out the Church they allow (as we heard) the uſe of Reaſon and Judgement. Now that muſt be by examining her marks; and ſeeing a chief marke of the Church is *Sanctitas doctrinæ* (as *Bellar.* and others doe truly acknowledge) it implyes a judging of all her Doctrines, before a Man can truly know by the purity of them, that this is the Church.

Again, when the Church is found out, yet ſtill the queſtion remains, whether it be Infallible? there alſo muſt the uſe of Reaſon and Judgment be allowed; for no reaſon it ſhould be taken upon her own word, that ſhe is the onely Infallible guide. Therefore *Bellarmine* was enforced to ſay (though untruly) that the Infallibility of the Romiſh Church, Councils and Popes, ſtands upon *apertas promiſſiones*, naming *Act.* 15. *Viſum eſt Spiritui ſancto & nobis*, and *Luk.* 22. *Rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides, lib.* 3. *de verbo Dei, cap.* 14. Now if theſe places, and all other they bring to that purpoſe, be acknowledged ſo plain, that it is eaſie for any man, uſing his Reaſon

Of this at large below, Chap. 17.

and

and Judgment to see this priviledge of the Roman Church in them (when as indeed no reasonable consequence can draw it out of them) who cannot but justly say, the places of Scripture we bring against their Errours are more open and plain to him that will duly use his Reason and Judgement?

Chap. XII.

Of knowing the Church by the marks of Eminencie, Perpetuity, *&c.*

Cardinal *Perron*, in his first book, *cap.* 5. and 6. against the Kings Letter, seems to cut the businesse shorter, and to leave men the use of Reason and Judgement in knowing the Church, not by examining her Doctrines, but by considering her external, and more sensible marks, such as are easie and proportionable to every mans capacity, *viz. Eminencie, Amplitude, Perpetuity*, or *Succession*, and the like. And when the Church is known by these, then a man is to know by her the sense of places of Scripture, which need interpretation. But what he saith for this easie discovery of the

out of Scripture, *A City on an Hill cannot be hid*, Mat. 5. was ſpoken by our Saviour of the Apoſtles, and their preaching of the Goſpel; and if applyed to the Church, it does not prove ſhe can alwaies be known by theſe marks. Nor does St. *Auſtin*'s application of that Scripture, to the knowing of the Church in his time, imply the Church ſhall alwaies be ſo. Not ſo now, when it ſtands divided by *Eaſt* and *Weſt*, the Eaſtern Church challenging theſe marks as well as the Weſtern; Unleſſe it come ſhort of the Romiſh Church in *Eminencie* of outward ſplendor, when as it is more Chriſtian-like to continue under preſſures ſo many yeares; the Romiſh Church may be eminent for pomp, and have more of the world in it, but the Greek Church is eminent for ſufferings, and has had more of the Croſſe. Now ſeeing the *Greek* Church, which has theſe marks, is in the Roman account heretical, and the Roman Church likewiſe condemned by the Greek, how ſhall a man know which of theſe to joyn to, but by examining their Doctrine, and judging of it?

The *Cardinals* ſimilitude of a Teſtator (ſordaining one to be the Interpreter of his

his Teſtament, that has a name common to others, and therefore aſſigning marks to know him by, ſo clear that they need no Interpreter) cleares not the buſineſſe. For did ever any hear of an Executor, or Interpreter of a Teſtament markt out by his gray head or *antiquity*, by tallneſſe of ſtature, *amplitude*, or *eminencie* of perſon or eſtate, when his proper name and habitation would readily and ſufficiently diſtinguiſh him from all others? So had God markt out unto us in his Teſtament, that Church, which ſhould in all Ages be the infallible Interpreter of his Will, by the name *Roman*, and place of habitation, and in ſtead of *a City built on a Hill* (the Scripture ſo oft repeated by the *Cardinal*) ſaid, *a City built on ſeven Hills*, there needed no more to doe, but ſubmit Reaſon and Judgement to all which that Church commanded.

But ſeeing he has not done it, no not when occaſion of mentioning ſuch a priviledge, had any ſuch belonged to that Church, (I meane when St. *Paul* wrote to the *Romans*:) it is plain he has left us to know his Church by her Doctrine agreeable to his Word; for ſo muſt we hear the voice of the Sheepherd, eſpe-

cially when Churches of ſeveral Communions may challenge the former markes, the Greek as well as the Roman.

Now what hath been ſaid againſt knowing the Church by theſe markes, is not ſpoken, to deny the Roman (which challenges them) to be a Church, but that they mark her out for ſuch a Church as the Cardinal would have us take her for; ſuch a Church as Saint *Auguſtine* ſpeaks of, *viz. the Catholike Church*, the Church, in which onely the Paſtors voice is to be heard, for what ſhe pretends to by theſe marks alone, ſhe muſt allow to the Greek Church alſo. It is not theſe barely without conſideration of doctrine, that could marke her out for a true Church, but that ſhe ſtill together with theſe holds the foundation. And in regard of that we acknowledge the Paſtors voice was ſtill heard in her, yet ſo that the voice of falſe Shepheards have often out-cryed him, yea, cryed him down in many points of high concernment to his ſheep. Yet by Gods providence his voice was ſtill heard, and his Word or Scripture ſtill preſerved, whereby the voice of falſe Shepheards might be diſcerned from the true one, the Errors and Superſtitions prevailing

ing known from the Truth and faith once delivered.

When the voice of the great Paſtor (*except ye eat the fleſh*, &c. *Joh.* 6.) was generally miſtaken in the Church, and miſ-applyed to the communicating of Infants, there was enough of his voice and word ſtill heard in the Church to diſcover the Error, and reſtore the Truth. When Image-worſhip was cryed up by the *ſecond Nicene Council*, and advanced in the *Weſt* by the Romiſh Biſhops, yet was there enough in the word and voice of the Shepheard (known in the Church) to condemn it in the Council of *Frankford*, and elſwhere. When Pope *John* 22. defined the place of faithfull Souls to be out of Heaven till the Reſurrection, and enjoyned it to be profeſſed by thoſe that took degrees in the Univerſities: yet was there enough ſtill in that Church to condemn it in the Council of *Florence*. When the voice of the Shepheard in thoſe places, *Feed my ſheep*, Joh. 21. 16. *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock*—Mat. 16.18. *I have prayed for thee*—Luk.22. 32. was miſtaken, and miſ-applyed for ſome Ages, to advance the Popes Infallibility, and power over all, there was e-

nough ſeen by the Council of *Baſil* and *Conſtance* to define the contrary, and conclude a Council to be above him. And however the noyſe again is greater in the Church of *Rome*, for the Pope than a Council, yet is there enough ſtill heard in that Church by the *French* generally, and all moderate *Romaniſts*, to know the untruth of it. So we ſay, whatever becomes of the Cardinals marks, *Eminencie*, *Antiquitie*, &c. (by which he would have her marked out for the onely Church, in which the Paſtors voice is to be heard) the Romiſh Church hath failed in her doctrine, cryed up Errours and Superſtitions, yet ſo, that the Paſtors voice hath been heard, and his word ſo preſerved there, that enough to diſcover them.

And now to ſome applying of what hdth been ſaid touching uſe of Reaſon and Judgement, to our Caſe of Reforming. We examined the Church of *Rome* by the Marks, *Eminencie*, *Antiquity*, *Succeſſion*; We ſee they agree not to that alone, nor that in Saint *Auguſtines* purpoſe, as he applyed the like Marks to the Catholike Church: Nor doe they imply that Church, where barely found, to be

a

a Church designed by God, to remaine uncorrupt, much lesse to be the Infallible Interpreter of his Testament.

Also we examined that Church by that maine mark of *Sanctity of Doctrine* (using our Reason and Judgement (which they allow in this point) and that the judgement of a National Church) and found her so far from being Infallible, that she was grosly corrupted in her Belief and Worship: Of which we had apparent conviction from the evidence aboveſaid, to wit, Scripture and Primitive practise, either of which excels the judgement and authority of the present Church of *Rome*.

CHAP. XIII.

Our way opens not a gap to Sectaries.

NOw to the last part of the Objection, *The opening hereby of a Gap to all Heresie and Schism.*

Answ. Due use of Reason and Judgement does it not; Sectaries that are gone out from us, cannot, 1. Pretend to such a way of Reforming the Church, or to such a Judgement as our Reformation was

brought about by; they wanting the Authority which is needfull to it in every National Church. They as Members of this Church owed obedience and ſubjection to the Government and Governours thereof, by divine precept; and could doe nothing as to a Reformation more than private men; whereas the Church of *England* (if under the Patriarchate of *Rome*, according to Eccleſiaſtical Canon; which would not have been contended about; yet) ſtood not bound to the uſurped power thereof; but being a National Church, might juſtly eject that Uſurpation, and make Reformation within it ſelf of all Errors, maintained by that pretended Power and Authority.

2. As for that, wherein they diſſent from this Church, they cannot pretend to ſuch Evidence we ſpoke of; they doe not at all pretend to the practiſe and conſent of the firſt Ages, nor have they plain and evident Scripture, but places unlearnedly wreſted. The Evidence required in diſſenting from Authority, is ſuch as by expreſſe words, or direct conſequence is apparent to all that can uſe their Reaſon without prejudice of ſelf-intereſt or faction. But we muſt note a different evi-

dence

dence in regard of things propounded by the Church, as matters of Faith and Worſhip— and things enjoyned, as circumſtantials of Worſhip, or pertaining to Order, Diſcipline. In the firſt ſort the Church indeed ſtands bound to ſhew them evidently out of Gods Word, to be ſuch, before they can be received by faith and full aſſent for ſuch; becauſe it is the office of the Church, or Governours thereof, not to make ſuch, but to declare and propound them: But they that will charge the Church in thoſe Propoſals with Hereſie, Superſtition, or Idolatry, muſt have the full and apparent evidence aforeſaid. In the ſecond ſort, Things Circumſtantial, and of Order, and propounded only for ſuch by the Church, they that diſſent and refuſe to yeeld obedience, muſt have moſt cleare evidence that ſuch things are unlawfull and forbidden by Gods Word, becauſe that Word of God moſt evidently gives power to the Church, to make, conſtitute, and ordaine ſuch things, and expreſly commands obedience to Superiours. Now for the things which the Church of *Rome* propounded and impoſed as matters of Faith and Worſhip; as ſhe had not evidence for them out of Gods

Gods Word, which was enough for our refuſing them as matters of Faith and Worſhip, ſo we had ſufficient evidence of Scripture and Antiquity againſt them. Whereas all that this Church of *England* propounds as matter of Faith and Worſhip, is moſt clear by Scripture, and conſent of Antiquity: So that it is moſt unreaſonable for our Sectaries to deny it, and impoſſible for them to have evidence againſt it. Much leſſe is it poſſible for them to be convinced out of Gods Word of the unlawfulneſſe of circumſtantials and matters enjoyned, as of Order, and to have as apparent evidence for that conviction, as Gods Word gives them for obedience to their lawfull Governours.

3. Their pretending to be convinced in their judgement, hinders not the Church of which they were members, to uſe her own judgement, and accordingly to proceed by cenſure and excommunication, as i. ſaid above, *cap.* 9. And hereby was this Church held together in Unity, no Sect or Hereſie breaking forth which was not preſently cruſhed, till force of Arms bore down the free uſe of Eccleſiaſtick Authority, and emboldened men to contemn it.

If

If therefore Sectaries ſhall ſay to us, you allow us to uſe our Reaſon and Judgment in what you teach us. True, ſay we, for your own ſatisfaction, but not to abuſe it againſt the Church. But we doe not, ſay they, abuſe it, but have conſulted our Guides, and uſed all meanes we can for ſatisfaction. We tell them, you muſt bring evident Scripture and Demonſtration againſt publick Authority of the Church, & having modeſtly propounded it, attend the judgement thereof, to which if you cannot aſſent inwardly, yet yeild an external peaceable ſubjection, ſo far as the matter queſtioned is capable of it, (which I adde becauſe the matter queſtioned may be not ſo much in belief and opinion, as in worſhip and external practiſe:) For that muſt neceſſarily diſcover it ſelf: and if it be ſuch in any Church, that a man cannot in conſcience comply with, and therefore cannot yeild external ſubjection ſo far as to doe or perform the ſame worſhip or practice; yet ought he ſtill to yeild a peaceable ſubjection, in not reſiſting or reviling, but quietly ſuffering (if need be) for the ſame under Authority. But you that diſſent from the Church of *England* have no

ſuch

ſuch cauſe for any thing belonging to the ſubſtance of Worſhip: And as for Circumſtantials and matters of Order, ye ought to ſhew as direct Scripture againſt the particulars, as that which commands you to *obey them which are over you.* And if your miſ-informed conſcience bade you forbear to ſubmit to the doing of things enjoyned, yet ſhould you have had ſo much conſcience of the expreſſe precept commanding obedience to Superiours, as to forbear reſiſtance and force, and to have rather quietly and peaceably ſuffered under the cenſures of the Church, and power of Authority ſet over you; and you cannot but think it reaſonable, that the Church, which is entruſted with others as well as you, and hath the advantage of Authority and publick judgement, ſhould upon the not-appearing of your pretended evidence, maintaine her Judgement and Authority, and proceed againſt you, as the preſervation of Peace and Unity requires. And thinke not becauſe you are allowed to uſe your Reaſon and Underſtanding in order to your beleeving and reaſonable ſerving of God, you are therefore allowed to uſe force in order to the maintaining of your diſſent from,

from, and diſobedience to Authority: For that God whoſe Truth and Service ye ſo much pretend, is *the God of Order and Peace* (1 *Cor.* 14.33.) not the Author of Confuſion; ſuch as your violence has wrought in this Church and Land.

No other meanes or remedy has the Church to preſerve Unity, than by demonſtrating the Truth to every mans conſcience, and cenſuring or caſting out the Refractory. Nor other feare can ſhe caſt upon her children to keep them in obedience, than the loſſe of her Communion, and their Anſwering it to God. Nor was there any other Remedy in the Antient Church, while deſtitute of help from the Secular power, I meane no other Remedy proper to the ſociety of the Church, to keep men in her Communion.

Chap. XIV.

Their vain pretence of Infallibility.

HEre the Romaniſts lay hold on a ſeeming advantage by pretence of an Infallible guidance in their Church, telling their Proſelytes, that the Proteſtants

ſtants acknowledge their Church fallible in her Propoſals, and therefore muſt leave men to their own reaſon and judgement; but our Church is infallible in her Definitions. How we Proteſtants leave men the uſe of their Reaſon and Judgement, rather than leave them to their Reaſon & Judgement, has been ſhewn already; and to the Romiſh pretence of Infallible guidance, we ſay ſtill, could it be made good, there would be no more to doe, but every man upon underſtanding the terms and ſenſe of her Definitions, to ſubmit his Reaſon and Judgement without farther enquiry, how conſonant they are to Gods revealed will, and what warrant he has from thence to aſſent and believe them. But here's the weakneſſe and vanity of that pretence: This Infallibility which is pretended as the ground of all their belief, has no ground it ſelfe to be believed (* as we ſhew by many moſt evident arguments) and that which is alledged to take away mens Reaſon and Judgement, muſt allow every man his Reaſon and Judgment in the examining of what is brought to prove it, as was ſhewn above, *Chap.* 11. *&c.* Whereupon it will be harder to make men believe that

*See below Chap. 27. &c.

that pretence of Infallibility, than to believe the propoſals of Truth, from Guides that pretend not to it, but onely to the demonſtration of that Truth by an Infallible Rule.

Hence it is eaſie to ſee, which is more reaſonable and likely to keep men in obedience to the Church; Open and plaine dealing with them in the buſineſſe of their ſalvation, or falſe pretences? The demonſtration of Truth to every mans conſcience, or the Imperious dominion over other mens faith and conſciences, under pretence of Infallibility?

We ſay to men, If you will be with us, you ſhall ſee what you doe: we require your obedience to what we demonſtrate to be Gods will, for you to believe and doe, yet know your ſalvation is concerned in ſuch obedience, and be it at your utmoſt peril to gainſay.

The Church of *Rome* ſaith to men, If you will come to me, you muſt put out your Eyes, reſign up your Reaſon and Underſtanding, and with implicite Faith give abſolute ſubmiſſion and obedience to my Definitions.

Chap. XV.

Dividing from the Roman Church is not a dividing from the Catholike.

ANother of their maine Objections upon our diviſion from them, is, That, whatever the Doctrine or Faith be which we retained, we divided from the whole *Catholike Church*, holding Communion with no part of it. To the ſame purpoſe is that which Cardinal *Perron* (in his Letter to M. *Caſaubon*, and in his *firſt book againſt the Kings Letter*) alledgeth, That to be Catholike, and avoid the note of Schiſm, is not ſufficient to hold the ſame Faith with the Catholike Church (for ſo did the *Donatiſts*) but to hold Communion alſo with it; which the *Donatiſts* not doing, were Schiſmaticks: And in like manner he would conclude us to be.

Our Anſwer in generall is briefly this, That we did not divide from the Catholike Church, and that to a Communion with it is not required a full agreement in belief and practiſe with other parts of it: No nor an actual Communion with them alwaies, and ſimply neceſſary: and that our

our Caſe and the *Donatiſts* is different, as St. *Cyprian*'s and their caſe was.

Now to clear theſe more fully. We ſay firſt: It was neither our intent (when we reformed) to divide from the Catholike Church, or any part of it, neither did we. We onely ſought to reforme our ſelves, leaving them to themſelves. We had indeed to doe only with the *Roman Church*, which being a particular Church, as it may utterly faile, without failing of the Catholike Church, ſo may it ſurely be in ſuch a meaſure corrupted, that it deſerves to be divided from. Yet our aime and intent was only to leave the Errours and Superſtitions we practiſed with her, and ſo to leave her no farther than her Communion was mixed with thoſe Superſtitious practiſes, *i.e.* to leave her no farther than ſhe had left her ſelf (as we can prove) or receded from what ſhe was for belief and practiſe in the more antient and purer Times.

Now here's the uſual miſtake, and upon the Romaniſts part the common prejudice againſt us; that they ſtill take the *Roman Church* and her Communion for the *Catholike*, and what they meet with in the Fathers touching the *Catholike Church*

Church to this or like purpose (that Communion with it is necessary, that there is no salvation out of it) they apply to the *Roman*, or touching Communion with the *Roman* Church or Bishop, to the proving any man Catholike thereby: They appropriate it to that Church as a special prerogative, when as the Fathers did also prove the like by communion with other Churches and Bishops, confessedly Catholike, although not so frequently, because Roman Church and Bishop of it was then of all other most eminent. Upon this double misapplication, those many Testimonies which Cardinal *Perron* (in his Epistle and Answer) has heaped up out of St. *Augustine*, and others, come to no purpose: For to be *Extra Ecclesiam Romanam*, is not presently to be *Extra Catholicam*. For though it was a good argument of old, when that Church was eminently and confessedly sound, to conclude affirmatively, as the Fathers often did) such were good Catholiques, because in Communion with that Church; yet now since *Rome* is notoriously corrupt and unsound, the argument will not hold, to conclude Affirmatively. Much less will it hold Negatively, to argue, such are no Catholiques,

theliques, becauſe not in Communion with *Rome*. Nay when *Rome* of old was found in Belief and Doctrine, it did not alwaies conclude the Negative (as will appear by the Inſtances below of the *Aſian* and *African* Churches out of Communion with the *Roman*) much leſſe can it conclude Negatively now.

CHAP. XVI.

The Greek Church, a Church, and part of the Catholick.

FUrthermore, beſides the *Roman* we acknowledge other Chriſtian Churches parts of the Catholique, and we ſay wee are not out of Communion with them, as the Church of *Rome* is by an actuall declaring of Non-communion to each other: For though wee agree not with thoſe Churches, in all doctrines and practiſes (which is not *De facto*, neceſſary to the holding of Communion 'twixt parts of the Catholick) yet we holding them ſtill parts of the Catholick Church, and they us, and not pronouncing Non-communion to each other, we both remain in the Unity or Matrice (as *Cyprian* phraſes

phraſes it) of the Catholike Church.

Now as to our opinion of the Greek Church, we conceive, their denying the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt to be *from* the Son, but yeelding it to be *by* the Son, to be onely a difference in form of ſpeech, not of any Heretical meaning, as they are acquitted by ſome learned Romaniſts.

And for their opinion and judgement of us, we ſay, that Cenſure of *Jeremias* one of their Patriarchs, (which the Romaniſts object againſt us as condemning the Proteſtant Doctrine in many points) is not found to be warranted by any Authority of the Greek Church: and to it we may oppoſe the judgement of *Cyril* their late Patriarch, who approves our Church and doctrine.

But they ask, ſeeing we left the *Roman*, why did we not joyne to the *Greek*, or ſome other Church, or part of the Catholick?

Reſp. We were joyned with them in the Catholick Church, (as ſaid before) but if by joyning our ſelves to ſome other Church, they meane holding and practiſing as that Church doth, we ſay againe (as above) ſuch agreement between the parts of the Catholick, is not neceſſary

to

to Catholick Communion. 2. We ſay, it was not neceſſary for us. Firſt, becauſe we were a National Church, and therefore not bound to joyn ſo, as to put our ſelves under any particular Church of one denomination. Private perſons indeed are bound ſo to be joyned to one Church or other which are parts of the Catholick. Secondly, becauſe our worke was Reformation, and caſting off the Romiſh Errours, and wee ſaw no particular Church, but needed Reformation very much; and therefore we could not joyne to any ſo as to agree with them in all doctrines and practiſes.

Theſe conſiderations ſhew, the many Teſtimonies brought out of the Fathers by the Romaniſts, for neceſſity of Communion, come not home to our caſe. For as they are abuſed when applyed to the Communion of the *Roman Church* (as above noted) ſo are they not altogether applicable to the Catholick Church now, as it ſtands in a condition far different from what it was in St. *Auguſtines* time. At the time of the Reformation, it was found divided in two parts, accuſing each other of Errour and Schiſm: It was our part then to conſider, what Errours we had

had received by communion with the *Romiſh Church*, and finding them to be many and great, it was not for us to make any other part of the *Catholike Church* a rule or pattern of Reformation, but to look to Gods Word, and the Primitive practiſe, when the Catholike Church was in ſuch an intire eſtate, that the above mentioned Teſtimonies were truly appliable to her. Which Church is by both ſides confeſſed and acknowledged to have been ſo right and ſound, that none could have cauſe to leave the Communion of any part of her; Which Church alſo muſt be acknowledged to be of more Authority than the preſent *Romiſh* or *Greeke* Church. From that Word of God was our Rule, from that Primitive Church was our pattern, and by holding to that rule, and pattern, as neare as we could, if we ceaſe to believe and practiſe many things as the Church of *Rome* doth, or not agree in all doctrines and practiſes with other parts of the Catholique Church, we cannot be ſaid for that to have no Communion with the Catholike Church.

CHAP.

Chap. XVII.

Of agreement and external Communion twixt the parts of the Catholike Church.

But further to cleare this point of actual communion and agreement betweene the parts of the Catholique Church by some Instances. In the points of *keeping Easter*, and *Rebaptization*, it is evident,

First, that the *Asian* and *Roman* in the one, and the *African* and *Roman* in the other, did not agree for doctrine and practise.

Secondly, that they could not communicate one with the other, not onely in the keeping *Easter*, or in the very practise of *Rebaptization*; but those that held Rebaptization necessary, could not at all communicate with any of those members of the Catholike Church, which had been received from heresie, without being baptized again.

Thirdly, that upon the heat of the Romish Bishops (*Victor* and *Stephen*) in these two businesses, it came to an actuall denying of Communion with

the *Asian and African* Churches.

What Cardinall *Perron* concludes upon thoſe Churches ſo ſtanding out, as to the point of Schiſm, he has not expreſly declared, notwithſtanding he treates of both their oppoſitions againſt the Biſhops of *Rome* then being. (*lib.3.cap.2. & 3.*) Hee ſeemes indeed to leave the *Aſians* under Schiſme: but that is to take the Crown of Martyrdome from many of thoſe godly *Aſian* Biſhops. And we read, that as *Irenæus* and others reproved *Victors* Excommunicating of them, ſo they held them not cut off from the Catholick Church, and profeſſed they would not deny to communicate with them, as *Euſebius* witneſſeth *Lib.5. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* After-ages alſo have excuſed them: And the like charity (if the Romaniſts had it for us) might excuſe us; or rather commend what we have done.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

The want of that does not alwaies make guilty of Schism.

YEt hence appears, that which the *Cardinal* often presseth, that all the Members of the Catholike Church must communicate one with another) is onely true of *duty*, so they ought to doe and keep themselves; not of *fact*, or under necessity of being guilty of Schisme, or cut off from the Communion of the Catholike Church. For we see, that neither want of agreement in all doctrines and practises does it; nor yet all want of actuall or external Communion does it; as when Communion is forborn, or denyed by one Church to another, without uncharitable denying of one the other to be parts of the Catholike. And the Testimonies of Fathers speaking of Communion, upon occasion of the case between the *Donatists* and the *Catholike Church*, are not to be extended to all actual *Noncommunion*, which often happened between eminent persons denying it to each other, and between several Churches doing the like, yet both remaining in the Catholike.

To theſe two Inſtances out of Hiſtory, let me adde two other upon ſuppoſall. The errour in the beliefe and practiſe of Communicating Infants prevailed in the CatholikeChurch generally,and for many Ages, and was reformed without a General Council. It muſt be ſuppoſed ſome one National Church did reforme it ſelf, in that belief and practiſe; and it muſt be acknowledged juſtly done; for the whole Catholike Church did accordingly reforme. Now ſuppoſe it had not, but ſtill perſiſted in that beliefe and practiſe; that National Church which firſt reformed, muſt either have returned to the errour it had juſtly left, or ſtood divided in Communion to the reſt of the Catholike Church, at leaſt from thoſe parts of the Catholike Church, that held Infant-communion neceſſary, upon the like place of Scripture, *Joh.* 6. 53. anſwerable, as they thought, to that other, *Joh.* 3 3 concerning Baptiſm, which perſiſting in the belief, that one Sacrament was neceſſary to children as well as the other, could not have admitted thoſe, that reformed, as good Chriſtians, no more than thoſe that ſhould have denyed Baptiſm to their children. Now ſtl ere did not follow a diviſion,

ſion, becauſe the reſt of the Church followed in the Reformation: But ſuppoſe they had not, I would then learn of the *Cardinal*, whether he would have accounted that Nationall Church guilty of Schiſme, or of the diviſion of Commuon, which had followed upon their doing that which they did juſtly, & through the default of other Churches in not doing that, which they ſaw good cauſe to doe.

He that will apply this to the Reformation of this National Church, and the default of the Roman Church in not doing the like, will ſee that want of external Communion does not alwaies cut off from the Catholike Church, and will ſee cauſe alſo of excuſing us.

My ſecond Inſtance upon ſuppoſall, is from that which was intended in *France*. The League had divided the Roman Catholikes there; but that being broken, the King and his party endeavoured reconciliation with the Pope; and finding him averſe, and ill to be dealt with, it was determined to ſet up in *France* a Patriarch, and to have no more to doe with the Court of *Rome*; and the Perſon was deſigned for it, as the Hiſtory of thoſe

Times assures us. I would now learne of the *Cardinal* (who was at length the Kings Proxy in his reconcilement to *Rome*; and its like was privy to his designe) had this been executed, with what part of the Catholike Church had they communicated? or had they been guilty of Schisme? If it be said, it was not done, yet it was resolv'd on, and so near to the execution, that a Cardinal told the Pope, As *Clement* the seventh had lost *England*, so *Clement* the eighth would lose *France*. And as it was resolv'd on, so it was thought reasonable and just, by the more considerable part of Roman Catholikes in *France* (*viz.* those that adhered to the King) and to be maintained, if done. So here's the difference, they in *France* had *approved* it, we in *England did* it.

Chap. XIX.

Our case and that of the Donatists not alike.

And now, that which was objected above by the *Cardinal*, that it's not enough for Catholikes to hold the same faith with the Catholike Church, but must

must hold Communion with it too: we grant most true; but then is that rule broken, when men hold not the Communion, or forsake it, as the *Donatists* did: who as they had no cause in regard of the faith (by reason of any dangerous doctrines or practises imposed on them) to cease from communicating with any part of the Catholike Church, so they divided from the whole through the breach of charity, condemning it for no Church, and drawing the communion wholly to themselves. And in some of those sentences the *Cardinal* alledges out of Saint *Augustine*, the breach or want of charity is expresst as the reason of condemning the *Donatists*. Now as for us, we had just cause in regard of *the faith once delivered*, to free it and our selves from errours and superstitions, not confining the Church within our Communion, or condemning other Churches as no parts of the Catholike. Therefore the case of the *Donatists* cannot concern us, who offended not, either by breach of the Faith, or of Charity. But the cause of Division, or breach of Communion must rest upon the Roman Church, which had neither will to reform as she *ought*, nor yet charity to beare with

them that *did*; and the case of the *Donatists* does most fit that Church, which uncharitably condemnes *all other*, and confines the Communion to *her self*. For, as to the *Cardinals* making the case of the *Donatists* and ours the same, I would learn of him: Whether, if the *Donatists* had onely used *their* liberty and judgement in that practise of rebaptizing Heretiques, leaving other Churches to their liberty, and (though thinking them in errour for admitting Heretiques without baptizing them, yet) willing to have Communion with them, as parts of the Catholike Church (saving the practises wherein they differed) whether then had they been guilty of Schisme? If he say, Yea: then must he condemne Saint *Cyprian*, and all the *African Bishops*: For they went so far, yea farther, to an undervaluing of Pope *Stephens* heat against them; who had sent out the sentence of Excommunication against the Bishops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia* and *Galatia* (who were in the same cause with Saint *Cyprian*) and forbade Communion with Saint *Cyprian*, and the *Africans*, and all that held rebaptization.

What ever the Cardinal judges of them,

as

as to the point of Schisme, (for though in his third *Book*, third *Chapter*, he treats of the oppositions of Saint *Cyprian* against Pope *Stephen*, and speakes of the Popes condemning him, yet sayes nothing directly, as to the judging of him in Schism, or out of the Communion of the Church) Saint *Augustine* did not judge them so, no not when often pressed by the *Donatists* with St. *Cyprians* example, he might with a ready answer have turned off the weight of Authority by leaving the person under guilt of Schisme, as one out of Communion of the Church: but this he did not alwaies speaking honourably of him, as of a worthy Martyr, and onely disproving his reasons for Rebaptization Nor did after-Ages judge him and the *African* Bishops, though out of Communion with *Rome*, to be therefore guilty of Schisme, condemning notwithstanding the *Donatists*, as notorious Schismaticks, because in the one there was a bare want of external Communion with *Rome*, without an uncharitable breaking with, or condemning of either the *Roman* or the rest of the Churches, that did not rebaptize; but in the other (*viz.* the Donatists) there was a wilfull breaking

with, and uncharitable condemning of the Church.

By all which may appear: our caſe is different from the *Donatiſts*, is like that of St. *Cyprian* and his *African Biſhops*, wanting communion with the *Roman*, but not therefore out of communion with the *Catholike*.

And we have ſo much more advantage in the caſe, that the occaſion of their *non Communion* was the *maintaining of an Errour*, though *tolerable*; the occaſion of ours, the *caſting off intolerable Errours*.

CHAP. XX.

Of Hell-Gates not prevailing againſt the Church.

ANother generall Objection they make againſt our dividing from them. If, ſay they, it was for ſuch damnable Errours and Superſtitions, as the Proteſtants charge the Roman Church with, then had the Gates of Hell, contrary to our Saviours promiſe, prevailed againſt the Church.

We anſwer, by denying the conſe-

quence,

quence. For from the charging of the Church of *Rome*, (which is but a part of the Catholike Church) with ſuch errours, it does not follow that Hell-gates have prevailed contrary to our Saviours promiſe; for they might have totally prevailed againſt the Roman Church to an utter ſubverſion of it (as of other particular Churches) and yet our Saviours promiſe ſtood firm. How far they have prevailed againſt that Church, the examination of her doctrines for beliefe and practice makes appear. We acknowledge indeed, that Hel-Gates did not prevail againſt the Church of *Rome* to a ſubverſion of the Faith in it, or to a totall infection of the members of it, with all the errours and ſuperſtitions that prevailed in it, and were advanced from time to time, chiefly by thoſe that had chiefe place in that Church.

But as to the Catholike Church we acknowledge that the Gates of Hell ſhall never prevaile to a ſubverſion, either of all the parts of it, or of ſaving Faith in it: There ſhall alwaies be a Church, and that a Church wherein ſaving Faith ſhall be preſerved, and may be had. And ſo Saint *Auguſtine de Symb. ad Catech. l.* 1. *c.* 5.

c. 5. ſeemes to render the ſenſe of that promiſe, when he repeats it thus; *The Gates of Hell ſhall not overthrow or conquer it.* And the *Council* of *Trent* ſeems plainly to acknowledge what Faith it is, againſt which the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail: Not the now Roman Faith (for by that the Gates of hel have far prevail'd upon the Church of *Rome*) but the antient Apoſtolike Faith once delivered, in all Ages profeſſed, and by us Proteſtants retained. For being met at *Trent* to eſtabliſh their new Faith, they beginne their meeting (as the Antient Councils did) with the confeſſion of the Chriſtian faith, repeating onely that Antient Apoſtolike Faith or Creed; and then adding, *This is the firme and onely Foundation againſt which the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevaile. Seſſ. Secund. Concil. Trid.*

Unto this paſſage I had in private this Reply, or cavil rather, returned; If the words of the Council import ſo much, then may the Church of Chriſt caſt off Baptiſm, and return to Circumciſion, and yet hold the foundation, becauſe profeſſing that Faith. But this cavill, or inference, is,

Firſt, inconſequent, as to the particular Inſtances,

Inſtances, Baptiſm and Circumciſion: For the one, the *Nicene Creed* tels us what a neceſſary conjunction it hath with the belief of Remiſſion of ſins in rendring the Articles, thus, *I believe one Baptiſm for the Remiſſion of ſinnes*; and for the other, the Apoſtle tels us, how inconſiſtent it is with the Faith of Chriſt, *Gal.* 5.2.3.

Secondly, it is impertinent, as to my application of that Confeſſion at *Trent*: for I alledged it not to ground any ſuch Inferences upon it againſt the whole Catholike Church, as if the Gates of Hell could prevail againſt it wholly, in all ſorts of Errours, ſaving the Verities and profeſſion of thoſe Articles of the Creed; but ſeeing they made that Creed the confeſſion of their Faith at *Trent*, according to the manner of Antient Councils; and acknowledged it in plaine words to be the onely foundation, *&c.*

I inferre firſt, That a Church holding that Foundation, may groſly erre in other things not ſo immediate to it, and yet be a Church. And indeed the Romiſh Church for theſe many Ages has had no tolerable Plea to the title and being of a *Church*, but ſo far forth as has held that foundation, however clogged with many Errours.

Secondly,

Secondly, that according to this their confeſſion, their New and additional Faith of *Trent* is not that Catholike Faith againſt which, as pretended, the Gates of Hell cannot prevail.

And laſtly, it ſhews, the intolerable boldneſſe of the Romiſh Church or Court, which after the *Tridentine* meeting feared not to adde their new Articles to that former Creed, (which they had confeſſed to be the onely foundation) as making up one entire Catholike Faith, and to ſubjoyn *Athanaſius* his Clauſe to it all, *Hæc eſt fides Catholica, extra quam, &c. This is the Catholike Faith, without which no ſalvation*— as appeares by *Pius quartus* his Bul, and the Oath which every Biſhop in that Church takes.

But that the Catholike Church has a promiſe in that large ſenſe Cardinal *Perron* ſpeakes it (*lib.* 1. *cap.* 18.) to continue perpetually pure and uncorrupted in her doctrine, we cannot ſay. We cannot ſay it in the Cardinal's ſenſe, for if we ſpeak of pure and uncorrupted doctrine, he meanes it of ſuch a priviledge and freedome from Errour as the Church of *Rome* challenges, which is not neceſſary to the preſervation of the Catholike Church

Church and Faith; or if we ſpeak of the Catholick Church, he takes it as moſt viſibly appearing in the chief Paſtors, and their adherents, binding that priviledge and freedom to that ſucceſſion or thoſe that are chief in it: Whereas we grant the Catholike Church wholly according to all the Paſtors and Members of it, ſhall not be infected with any deſtructive or dangerous Errours, but that purity of ſaving Doctrine ſhall be preſerved in it: Yet not bound as a Priviledge to any one Church (as to the *Roman*) or to thoſe that are for Number moſt, and for Place chief in the Church; but that in ſome part or other of the Catholike Church, and by ſome Paſtors it ſhall be preſerved and propagated: They that dreame of a Church alwayes ſo glorioufly viſible, and ſo apparently holding out Purity of Doctrine and Saving Truth (as the Romaniſts doe) to the end all men may readily finde out the true Church, and eaſily come to the knowledge of that Truth, do not conſider, that God doth ſomtimes for the ſins of Chriſtians, turning his grace into wantonneſſe, make his Word precious (as 1 *Sam.* 3.) and his ſaving Truth not to be found without difficulty, and dili-

diligent ſearch after it. We ſee the Fathers interpreted that promiſe (*the Gates of Hell ſhall not—*) of the *not failing of the Church*, never of the *not erring* of it; and we ſee by experience the contrary. As for example, the Millenary belief, and the excommunicating of Infants (both which the Church of *Rome* acknowledge errours) did as generally prevail in the Catholike Church, as any error of their New Faith can be ſaid (which they boaſt often) to be the general belief and doctrine of the whole Church.

We ſay then, The Gates of Hell cannot prevaile to the overthrowing of the Fundamental ſaving Faith, or to the corrupting and extinguiſhing of the Purity of ſaving Doctrine abſolutely through the Catholike Church: but may prevaile very farre and generally over the viſible face of the Church Catholike; *viz.* as it ſhews it ſelf in the parts of it, all particular Churches holding the Foundation: For theſe, conſidered, as above, according to their more viſible, and conſpicuous appearance in thoſe that are chiefeſt in them for place, and moſt for number, may loſe the purity of Saving Doctrine, and though holding the Foundation,

tion, admit of the Superſtructions of hay, ſtubble, and worſe: Errors in belief and practice: And though Hell-Gates may prevaile very farre and generally by Superſtructures, yet are they ſuch (at leaſt in ſome particular Churches) as the foundation may bear: Such as may ſtill be convinced by the Doctrine of Saving Truth preſerved ſtill in the Church. For the Paſtors voice (as was ſaid above, *cap.* 12.) will be ſo heard alwaies in the Church, that the ſtrange voice of falſe Teachers and falſe Doctrines may be diſcerned, and will by them that have eares to hear, and their ſenſes exerciſed to put a difference between good and evill, true and falſe.

Now the Romiſh Church (with which we had to doe) had not preſerved the Faith entire without mixture of many Errours and Superſtitions; had not kept the foundation clear from ſuch burthenſome and dangerous Superſtructures: yet has the fundamentall Faith in expreſſe termes been delivered downe in that Church, and ſuch ſaving knowledge, as was ſufficient to diſcern the Foundation from the Superſtructures; the true and ancient Faith, from the new erroneous Belief;

Belief; the true Paſtors voice, from the ſtrange Doctrines of unwritten Traditions. To follow that voice, to caſt off thoſe Superſtructures, to contend for the Faith once delivered, and clear it from adventitiall errours, that was our duty, and the work of our Reformation.

And thus far againſt their generall plauſible Pretences. Now to ſome Triall of their particular Doctrines of Belief and Practice, which we have caſt off, as erroneous and ſuperſtitious.

For the way of Triall, The Affirmative in thoſe Doctrines being theirs, it lies upon them to prove the Doctrines (affirmed by them) to be true and Catholike, by ſuch Rules as are allowable.

The Rules admitted by both ſides, though not in equal rank, are *Scripture*, and *conſent of Antiquity*, gathered by the Writings of the Fathers, and the Acts of ancient Councils. We ſay, they cannot by theſe make good what they affirm, but ſhew that both make againſt them.

Chap. XXI.

Of the Tryall of Doctrines by Scripture.

First for *Scripture.* Whatsoever is revealed in that *Scripture,* which both sides admit as Canonical, is likewise admitted by both sides, as of divine Authority. But such Scripture is not acknowledged by them as a sufficient Rule for the triall and judging of the controverted points; therefore they are necessitated to fly to *Tradition*; not that which delivers down to us the sense of any Scripture, by the consent of all Ages of the Church, but to unwritten Traditions, which deliver Doctrines of Belief and Practise that have not footing in Scriptures. This I note, because they are ready to abuse the unwary, by urging sometimes the former sort, to make them swallow unwritten Traditions upon the same pretence. For the former sort we grant, as appears by the points of Christianity not controverted between us, because these points as they are grounded on Scripture, so are they brought down to us by the profession

ſion and tradition of all Ages, as the confeſſed ſenſe of thoſe Scriptures on which they are grounded, and this not derogatory to the ſufficiency of Scripture. But to their other ſort of Traditions, *viz. unwritten* (on which they generally ground their Doctrines rejected by us) we cannot admit as any ground of Faith or Worſhip: ſuch Traditions being uncertain, not poſſibly to be proved Apoſtolical, but received upon the Teſtimony of their preſent Church, and indeed generally inconſiſtent with Scripture. Yet are we to note, that in all the controverted points they pretend Scripture, and alledge ſeveral places in every point; yea in thoſe points which they themſelves confeſs (as moſt of the controverted points are by the moſt ingenuous Romaniſts confeſſed) to have no ground or footing in Scripture. To let paſſe the want of candor and plain dealing in this, we muſt obſerve,

Firſt, that their labouring to pretend Scripture for every Doctrine, is a tacite acknowledgement that doctrines of Faith and Religion ſhould have their ground there. For inſtance; Invocation of Saints they acknowledge not uſed in the Old Teſta-

Teſtament, yea and give us reaſon for it, becauſe the ſouls of the Patriarchs were not then in heaven, and ſo not to be Invocated, yet doe they alledge very many places for it out of the Old Teſtament to make a ſhew of Scripture. So for the New Teſtament. They acknowledge Invocation of Saints departed was not commanded or taught by the Apoſtles, or in their time; yea and give us reaſons why it was not publiſhed at firſt; becauſe (ſay *Eckius, Copus, Salmeron.*) It had been unſeaſonable and dangerous for Jew and Gentile at firſt to have heard it, leſt they might think the Chriſtians ſet forth and worſhipped many Gods: or that the Apoſtles were ambitious of having ſuch honour done them after their death.

It is then acknowledged not to have been ſo much as taught in that firſt Age, and yet will they again (when they come to maintain it) make the world believe it was alſo written then, and bring many places of the New Teſtament for a ſeeming proof of it. So of *Image-worſhip, Purgatory, Indulgences*, and moſt of their Sacraments, the more ingenuous among them acknowledge (as our Authors have gathered their Teſtimonies) they have not

not ground in Scripture : and indeed if they truly had, why ſhould the Romaniſt ſo earneſtly contend for unwritten Traditions to hold them by? yet muſt Scripture be alledged for them all by every Conrroverſie-writer. Which conſequently (as was obſerved) does acknowledge that Doctrines of Faith and Religion ſhould be grounded there.

Secondly, that the neceſſity they have of reſting upon unwritten Traditions equalized in Authority to the written Word of God, is a plain confeſſion, they cannot ſtand by the undoubted Word of God, nor have any certaine ground of their New faith which reſts upon pretended uuwritten Traditions, and theſe you muſt take upon the word of their own Church.

Thirdly, that the ſame neceſſity of reſting upon unwritten Traditions, forces them to lay upon Scripture Imputations of Imperfection and Inſufficiency, of darkneſſe and obſcurity, very unbeſeeming the Teſtament of God; written by the dictate of Gods Spirit, and left us as a ſignification of his will, and a Rule for the direction of his Church.

Let us then take leave a little more largely

largely to speake to these two points: of the sufficient *perfection* of this written Rule, then of the sufficient *perspicuity* of it. The one casts off the necessity of their unwritten Tradition; the other, the pretence of their Infallible Judge or Interpreter. And upon these indeed rests the whole frame of the New Roman faith: and therefore worthy, of all other points, to be a little insisted on.

Chap. XXII.

Sufficient perfection of the Scripture, as a Rule.

First then, of the sufficient perfection of Scripture, which we say containes all things of themselves necessary to be believed, or done to salvation. All such things we say, it contains; not expressly, and in so many words, but either so, or as deducible thence by evident and sufficient consequence. The Romanists are forced to grant that the Scripture contains plainly the *prima credibilia* (as some of them expresse it) the first and chiefe points of belief; or those that are *simpliciter necessaria*, and *omnia omnibus necessaria*

ſaria (as *Bell.* expreſſes it, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 1.) but they alſo ſay, that there are many other things neceſſary in belief and practiſe to ſalvation, not there contained, or thence deduced; therefore they adde Traditions to make a ſupply.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of Traditions which we allow.

FOr Tradition, We allow,

1. That Univerſal Tradition which brings down *Scripture* unto us, through the conſent of all Ages, for that Tradition is ſuppoſed in the reception of the Scripture. But we ſay, the Scripture contains all material objects of Faith *neceſſary* to Salvation, *i.e.* all things that had been neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe and doe for Salvation, though there had been no Scripture.

Secondly, we allow that kind of Tradition which brings down the *ſenſe* of Scripture to us through all Ages of the Church. So the *Creed* may be called a Tradition, and other Catholike Declarations of the Church bringing downe the ſenſe of Scripture in any point of Faith.

Now

Now as the Scripture does ſuppoſe the former Tradition, ſo this kind ſuppoſes the Scriptures for its ground, delivering nothing but what is contained in them, and neither of theſe ſorts derogatory to the ſufficiency of them.

Thirdly, we allow ſome Traditions that bring down *matters of practiſe* touching Order, Ceremony, Uſages in the Church, as of Faſts, or Feſtivals, or Rites about Sacraments, and the like: But ſuch if they be not contained in the Scripture, ſo neither are they within the limits of the queſtion; which concerns neceſſaries to ſalvation: ſuch we deny thoſe to be; and ſuch things as are neceſſary to believe to ſalvation, we deny to come down to us by unwritten Tradition: and what Traditions the Romaniſts pretend for the controverted points, we deny that they contain ſuch things neceſſary, or to have been delivered down in all Ages; and therefore can be no ground for neceſſary faith, whether we conſider the matter of them, or the uncertainty of them. Our Arguments briefly are,

I. Such as ſhew the Scriptures ſufficient for Salvation; as *Joh.5.ver.39. for in them ye think ye have ſalvation.* Where our Sa-

viour ſuppoſes, they thought true in it, or elſe his reaſon had not been good— for becauſe they might have Salvation by them, *i. e.* know all things neceſſary to it, therefore he bids them *ſearch the Scriptures*, and they ſhould find, they teſtified of him— So 2 *Tim.* 3.15. expreſly, *they are able to make wiſe unto ſalvation*, &c. They have two ſhifts here;

1. That Scripture is profitable to that end; for that word (*Profitable*) (the Romaniſts lay hold on) becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith there, *All Scripture is profitable for doctrine*, &c. and ſo (ſay they) is every book *profitable* to that end, though not *ſufficient*, and ſo they will have the whole Scripture but partially profitable.

But we anſwer, *Sufficiencie* belongs to the whole Scripture, though in proportion alſo to every Book. And the other expreſſions of the Apoſtle there, ſhew this to be onely a ſhift. For he ſaid before, that Scriptures *are able to make wiſe to ſalvation*; can that be ſaid to be able to make a man wiſe to ſuch a purpoſe, and onely to doe it in part, and imperfectly, teaching him onely ſome knowledges to that purpoſe? Alſo he ſaith after, *ver.* 17.

by

by the Scripture, *The man of God is throughly furniſhed, or perfected to every good work, i.e.* to Doctrine, Inſtruction, &c. ſuch as he ſpoke of before; which muſt needs imply a *ſufficiencie to that end.*

2. Their other ſhift is, That the Scripture is ſaid to doe this, becauſe it contains many things plainly in it ſelf, and ſhews from whence we may have the reſt, *i.e.* from their Church. We anſwer, Had it ſhewn us that (which it does not) yet could not this ſhift be reaſonable here: For ſo the Law might have been ſaid to make us perfect, becauſe it ſhews us Chriſt, and was a *School-maſter to him*, *Gal.*3. and *John Baptiſt* might have been ſaid to have perfected his Diſciples, by ſhewing them Chriſt.

II. Such Arguments as forbid and exclude all Additions to the Scripture, and ſo imply the perfection and ſufficiency of it, and condemne their ſuper-added Traditions, as, *Deut.*4.2. and *cap* 12.32. againſt adding to his precepts. And *Rev.* 22. 18. a Woe pronounced to him that addes. And *Gal.* 1.6. an Anathema to them that bring in another Goſpel beſide what they had received. And *Gal.*3.15.

to a mans Teſtament none addes, much leſſe to Gods. And *Mat.* 15. our Saviour expreſly condemnes the *Phariſees* that taught for Doctrines of Worſhip, the Traditions and Commandements of men.

Now ſee, what ſhift they make with theſe places. One is, that the prohibition of adding concernes the whole Word of God written and unwritten, no man may adde to that. We anſwer, that the places of *Deut.* and of *Rev.* are expreſly of the written Word. Alſo that of *Gal.* 1. and *Gal.* 3. muſt be meant of the written: for that which is written beares the name of the *Goſpel*, and of the *Teſtament of God*, and can we thinke it beares it partially? Saint *Aug. lib.* 3. *contra Lit. Petil.* and elſwhere expreſly applies that of *Gal.* 1. to the Scripture, thereby excluding all doctrines of Faith not received from Scripture. And Saint *Hier.* upon 1. of *Hag.* relating to that place, ſaith, *Percutit Dei gladius*—that ſword of God, or *Anathema*, ſtrikes through all thoſe doctrines, which *abſque authoritate & teſtimonio ſcripturæ quaſi traditione Apoſtolicâ confingunt*; without the authority and teſtimony of Scripture they hold forth

forth under pretence of Apoſtolical Tradition. And for that other of Gods Teſtament, The Romaniſts muſt ſuppoſe that God Almighty has done, as it fares with many men, who intending to write their Will, and having begun, and prefixed the Title (*This is my Will and Teſtament*) and proceeded far in it, being prevented by haſtening death, leave the reſt by word of mouth: ſo will they have God to make a Will partly Written, partly Nuncupatory. Now how derogatory this is to the providence of God, who ſees not?

Another ſhift, That thoſe Traditions are onely forbid, which are contrary to what is written, and ſo no man may adde. We anſwer, The Apoſtle ſaith, *Gal.* 1. *præter, beſide that which ye have received*, and *Bell.* expreſly interprets that *præter* by *contra*; but in the judgement of Saint *Aug.* and St. *Hier.* in the places above cited it is enough to incurre the Anathema, if they teach any thing of faith, which is *beſides* that which is received from Scripture ſaith St. *Aug.* and *abſque authoritate & teſtimonio Scripturæ*, the authority and teſtimony of the Scripture, ſaith St. *Hier.* to which adde *Tertul.* a-

gainſt *Hermogenes*, *Non eſt ſcriptum, timeat va illud adjicientibus*, It is not written, Let him fear that curſe which is denounced againſt them that adde. It was then enough to bring a man under the woe pronounced againſt them that added, if the thing they added was not written; and not onely becauſe it was contrary to what was written. But our Saviours ſpeech, *Mat.* 15. taken from *Iſ.* 29. 13. *Their fear towards me is taught by the precepts of men*; ſhews that all Traditions, though not contrary to what is written, yet if they teach for *Worſhip* or *Faith* neceſſary to ſalvation, that which is not commanded or written, they are to be condemned. For though the Phariſees *Corban* was directly againſt the written command, yet their ſuperſtitious waſhing was not. And upon that occaſion our Saviour condemnes them as to this point. To this very purpoſe is one of St. *Baſil's* Ethick Rules, *Quicquid extra Scripturam eſt, cum non ſit ex fide peccatum eſt.* He ſaies not *contrà*, againſt; but *extra*, beſides, or without Scripture; and being ſo, it cannot be of Faith, and therefore ſinfull, if ſo propounded and impoſed: And this excludes the Romiſh Traditions from

from being rules of Faith or Worſhip; beſides that they are to be challenged of contrariety and repugnancy to Scripture for the moſt part.

Chap. XXIV.

Their Arguments againſt Scriptures ſufficiencie, and for Traditions.

THeir Arguments for their Traditions and againſt the ſufficiency of Scripture, are ſo many aſperſions caſt upon the undoubted Word of God, not without derogation to the Providence and Wiſdome of God, nor (for the moſt part) without ſome contradiction to themſelves.

Their firſt concerns the purpoſe of God in it, That he did not purpoſe it to contain a perfect Rule, becauſe the Penmen of holy Scripture had no command to write, but did it upon occaſion, or as *Bel.* (*neceſſitate quadam coacti*) upon occaſions miniſtred, and urging them to write.

We anſwer,

1. If the neceſſity of the Churches call'd for Scripture, and urged them to

write, it ſhews of what concernment it is to the Church.

But 2. though the neceſſity of the Church miniſtred the outward occaſion to ſome bookes, it ſuppoſes the purpoſe and ſpecial providence of God in applying them to the work. Hear *Bell.* himſelf acknowledging, *lib.* 4. *c.* 3. *Deo volente & inſpirante Apoſtolos ſcripſiſſe quæ ſcripſerunt*, That the Apoſtles wrote what they did write, by the will and inſpiration of God. This is well, but this amounts not to a command, ſaith he: Being then preſt with St *Aug.* ſaying, *Quicquid ille (Chriſtus) de ſuis dictis & factis nos legere voluit, hoc ſcribendum illis tanquam manibus imperavit*, Whatſoever Chriſt would have us read of his ſayings and deeds, that he commanded them to write. *lib.* 1. *de conſenſ. evang. c. ult.* He is forced to confeſſe they had *mandatum internum*, an internal command to write—And now what needs more? for if they had *had* all of them as expreſſe outward command as Saint *John* had to write his Revelations, or as *Moſes* had to write what he had from God, it would not have made it more the purpoſe of God, than did the inward command: Nor would it have

have made *Bellarmine* any whit more granted the Scripture of the Apoſtles to be written for ſuch a Rule; for he does not grant it of *Moſes* Writings, though he had ſuch a command, and therefore we may leave it as a vaine reaſoning.

But ſee what he ſaith of Scripture as written for a Rule, That it is a Rule, and *Regula fidei Catholicæ*, the Rule of Catholike Faith; and *Regula credendi certiſſima, & tutiſſima*, The Rule of Belief, and that moſt certain moſt ſafe. *Bell.* affirms *l.* 1. *c.* 2. and this is well towards a perfect Rule; and there he inferres upon it, ſeeing it is ſo, *ſanus profecto non erit, qui eâ neglectâ ſpiritus interni, ſemper incerti, ſæpe fallacis, judicio ſe commiſerit*, He is not well adviſed, who neglecting Scripture, reſts upon the judgement of a private ſpirit, which is alwaies uncertain, often deceiving. How well might the inference been made ſo againſt unwritten Traditions, ſeeing the ſcripture is *Regula fidei Catholicæ, & regula credendi certiſſima, tutiſſima, ſanus profecto non erit*, &c. *He is ill adviſed, who neglecting Scripture commits himſelf to unwritten Traditions, which are often deceitfull, alwaies uncertaine.* But in his *fourth Book cap* 12. Scripture is

with him but a partial Rule, unwritten Tradition is the other part: Nay, he denyes in the ſame Chapter, that it was the proper and chief end of Scripture to be a Rule, but to be *utile quoddam commonitorium ad conſervandam doctrinam ex prædicatione acceptam*; *A profitable means to admoniſh and remember them of the doctrine they had heard preached*: That profit indeed the Scripture did afford, but the end of that remembrance, and conſerving of the Doctrine preached was, that the Scripture ſhould be as a ſtanding Rule, or Guide to them, and ſo to us, that did not heare what the Apoſtles preached: To us it is not properly a Remembrancer, but a Guide and Rule; and that muſt be the chief end wherefore it was written.

But this to note, how this engagement for unwritten Tradition in his fourth Book, would not let him be conſtant to what he had fairly ſpoken of Scripture in his firſt. So it fares with moſt of them, Truth forces much from them, till they come to be confronted with an adverſary in defence of ſome point of their New Faith.

Their ſecond ſort of Reaſoning againſt the ſufficiency of Scripture, is by enume-

ration

rartion of ſome things neceſſary to be believed, which are not contained (ſay they) in Scripture. As firſt, That Scripture is the Word of God, is neceſſary to be believed, but not contained, or ſhewn by Scripture : This is in every of their mouthes. Among the reſt, *Bell.* thus, *lib.* 4. *Scripture cannot ſhew it ſelf to be the Word of God, for the* Alcoran *affirms alſo of it ſelf the ſame, that it is the Word of God.*

We anſwer,

Firſt to the Impertinency of this Cavil, That (as it was ſaid above in the ſtating of the Queſtion) to believe Scripture to be the Word of God, is not of thoſe material objects of Faith which we ſay are contained in Scripture, and are ſuch as had been neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe, though there had been no Scripture; alſo that the Scripture being received upon Univerſal Tradition (as we ſaid) does not derogate from the ſufficiency of Scripture, for that is a Tradition which Scripture ſuppoſes, does not exclude in this queſtion. For had the Scripture been never ſo full and ſufficient according to the Papiſts mind, *i. e.* had it plainly confirmed (if we may ſuppoſe

ſuch

ſuch a thing) all that they ſay is neceſſary to be learnt by unwritten Tradition, yet would it not have contained this (that it is the Word of God) otherwiſe then it doth, but muſt ſuppoſe that univerſall Tradition ſtill to bring it down to us. But we alſo ſay; that although Scripture is ſo brought down to us, yet being received upon ſuch Tradition, it diſcovers it ſelfe to be divine by it own light, or thoſe internal arguments (as they are called) which appear in it to thoſe that are verſed in it.

And now ſee what *Bellarmine* does here acknowledge, *lib.* 1. *cap.* . he makes the title of the Chapter, *Libris canonicis verbum Dei contineri*, among other arguments, he proves it excellently well by ſome reaſons drawne from Scripture it ſelfe, as by the conſpiration of the parts, the event of Prophecies, and the like, and there ſaith, *Sacris Scripturis nihil notius, nihil certius*: Now, when he comes to contend for unwritten Tradition againſt Scripture: Scripture cannot ſhew it ſelfe to be the Word of God more than the *Alcoran*. It had been well if *Bell.* had ſate down with his own diſhonour in contradicting himſelfe, and not uſed this,

this odious inſtance of the *Alcoran* to Gods diſhonour.

But as I noted at the beginning, their Neceſſity of reſting upon unwritten Traditions, forces them to caſt many aſperſions upon the undoubted Word of Almighty God. Heare what others ſay upon the ſame ſcore, the Jeſuite *Bailius* in his Catechiſme, *Without the Teſtimony of the Church, I would believe the Scripture no more than my Livy; no more than Æſops Fables*, ſaith another. *And how can it prove it ſelfe to be no Fable* (ſaith another Romaniſt) *more than any other writing that is mixed with Fables?* To this purpoſe are thoſe other reproaches, that fall from them The Scripture, a *mute letter*, as if no ſenſe in it, but as the Church gives it, a *noſe of wax*, as if applyable of it ſelf any way.

This the language their Diſciples muſt learne, to ſpeake reproachfully of that Word which was written by the Holy ſpirit of God, given them to ſalvation, and muſt judge them at the laſt day.

Another of their Inſtances of things neceſſary, but not contained in Scripture, is *Baptiſm of Infants*. This generally objected by

by them all: And amongſt them I ſingle out *Bell.* to anſwer himſelfe, or (as I may ſay) contradict himſelf in it. For *lib.*1. *de baptiſ. c.*8. he proves it by places of Scripture, and ſaith, the argument is ſtrong and effectual, and cannot be avoyded, and that the thing is evident in Scripture. Now when he contends for Tradition againſt Scripture, This thing of *Childrens Baptiſme* muſt be one of them that is neceſſary, and not contained in Scripture. This is not ingenuous nor conſcionable, but enough to anſwer the objection.

We ſay further, that *Baptiſm of Children*, as to the practiſe of it, is not contained expreſly in Scripture, *i. e.* it is no where commanded to be done, or ſaid, that they did doe it: But the grounds and neceſſity of it are ſufficiently delivered in Scripture, and that's enough for the doing of it; and that the Arguments from Scripture by *Bel.* and others alledged doe ſufficiently ſhew. And theſe are their chief Inſtances.

Their third and laſt ſort of reaſoning is from places of Scripture expreſly naming Traditions, as 1 *Cor.*11.2. 2 *Theſ.*2.15.

Anſw. The whole Goſpel was Tradition

tion till it was written: Now if they will have theſe places make for them, they muſt ſhew thoſe Traditions mentioned, did contain things neceſſary to ſalvation, and no where written. It is plain they did not. The firſt concerns Rites and Orders in their Aſſemblies; and the other, if unwritten, concerned the coming of Antichriſt, the falling away before it (the things ſpoken of in that Chapter, and not of neceſſity to know unto ſalvation) and that Tradition, if any more then was written touching thoſe points, being loſt, it appeares how well the Church of *Rome* is to be truſted in this buſineſſe of unwritten Tradition, that cannot ſhew thoſe which were, nor prove thoſe ſhe has, to be delivered by the Apoſtles.

Alſo from places of Scripture, which they will have to imply Tradition, as *Iok.* 16.12. *I have yet many things to ſay to you,* &c. 1 *Cor.*2.6. *We ſpeak wiſdome among the perfect*: and that to *Timothy*, *Cuſtodi depoſitum*—*That good thing committed to thee keep*—2 Tim 1.14.

Anſw. Theſe prove no more than the former place, unleſſe they can alſo prove and demonſtrate to us, that they concerned things not written, and yet neceſſary to ſalvation.

2. We

2. We muſt tell them that Hereticks of old did uſually pretend theſe very places for their unwritten doctrines, and made the like Inferences as the Papiſts do. St. *Aug.* upon *John* ſhews they would ſay, their doctrines were of the *multa* which Chriſt had to ſay, and *Tert. de præſcript. c.* 5. tels us, Hereticks alledged, the Apoſtles delivered ſome things openly to all, ſome things ſecretly to a few (the very thing the Papiſts ſay) and they proved it (ſaith he) by St. *Pauls* ſaying to *Timothy*, *Cuſtodi depoſitum*. St. *Iræn l.* 3. *c.* 2. ſhews Hereticks alledged the ſcriptures were obſcure, not to be underſtood by thoſe that know not Tradition ; alledging for it, that of St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 2. *we ſpeak wiſdome*, &c. *Tert.* in his Book *de reſur.* tels us, Hereticks cannot ſtand if you binde them, *de ſolis Scripturis quæſtiones ſuas ſiſtere*, to be judged by the Scriptures alone : and in the ſame book calls all Hereticks, *Lucifugas ſcripturarum*, ſuch as fly the light of the ſcripture.

And now we muſt ſay in the laſt place, their uſual objection of Hereticks alwaies alledging Scriptures and ſhunning Tradition, is moſt vain, as appeares by the former Teſtimonies. As for their alledging ſcripture,

ſcripture, it made for the dignity and ſufficiency of ſcripture; Hereticks well knowing the Authority Scripture had in the Church, and therefore that it was in vain to uſe other proofs without it, and ſo the Romaniſts are neceſſitated (as was ſaid above, *Chap.* 21.) to pretend it for the proving of thoſe points which they know, and ſometimes confeſſe are not grounded on ſcripture. As for Hereticks ſhunning Tradition, it is moſt true, they carefully ſhunned that Tradition which delivered down the ſenſe of ſcripture in the points of Faith through all Ages of the Church: for to ſhun that, was to ſhun the evidence and light of ſcripture. But as for unwritten Traditions (ſuch as we and the Romaniſts contend about) they ſhelter themſelves under the darkneſſe of them, made great advantage (as we ſaw) by pretence of them, alledging the very ſame reaſons and places of ſcripture for them, as the Romaniſts do, and ſo we leave them both well agreed in this point.

CHAP.

Chap. XXV.

The evidence of Antiquitie in the point.

NOw for the evidence of Antiquity. Though we are to ſpeake more generally to that trial by the Fathers afterward, yet here in brief to this particular point. There is ſcarce one Father, but we bring him expreſly witneſſing (as we affirm) the fulneſſe and ſufficiency of ſcripture in all things neceſſary. *Bell.* in *l.* 4. *c.* 11. ſets down very many of them, and admits them for the ſayings of thoſe Fathers, how then does hee decline them?

1. One of his General anſwers (and it is what others anſwer to) that the Fathers ſpeake of *omnia omnibus neceſſaria* to be contained in ſcripture. This the expreſſe teſtimonies of thoſe Fathers have extorted from him, which is no little prejudice to their cauſe (who equal tradition to the written Word, and plead the neceſſity of what is conveyed to us thereby) for if all things neceſſary for all be contained in Scripture, then ſurely the doctrines and faith delivered in unwritten Tra-

Traditions are not neceſſary for all. They indeed that have given up their belief to all the dictates of that Church, are conſequently neceſſitated to believe them, but we may be good Chriſtians and yet not believe them, becauſe not written, and not neceſſary it ſeemeth to all. That wch they can pretend to ſay here, is, that ſuch unwritten Traditions become neceſſary to be believed upon the propoſall of the Church, and to be by all believed, to whom they are ſufficiently propounded or made known. Indeed, of Scripture, we grant, All things there revealed become upon ſufficient propoſal of them neceſſary to be believed as true; yet not all to be believed, as neceſſary in themſelves to ſalvation. But of unwritten Traditions, we cannot ſay, Men are bound to believe them as true, upon the propoſall of their Church, unleſſe they can demonſtrate the teſtimony of their Church to be Infallible, or that ſhe propounds them upon full Catholike, or Univerſal Tradition, and conſent of all Ages; which they cannot doe: Much leſſe can we ſay, Men are bound upon the propoſal of their Church to believe them, as containing things neceſſary in themſelves

to

to ſalvation, unleſſe they can prove the contents of thoſe Traditions to be ſo, which is impoſſible; or that their Church can make new Articles of Faith, or thoſe things neceſſary to be believed to ſalvation, which were not ſo in themſelves before. This the ſober and moderate Romaniſt muſt and will deny.

2. He ſhifteth off their Teſtimonies, by reſtraining them to the particular thing there ſpoken of, as if they onely meant, the ſcripture was full to that point onely. When as indeed upon occaſion of ſome particular point, which they were proving, they ſpeak in general of the ſufficiency of Scripture, ſaying, it contains all things neceſſary. Therefore to take away theſe, and all ſuch ſhifts which they bring to reſtraine what the Fathers ſpoke generally, We ſhew they ſpoke ſo generally of the ſufficiency of Scripture, that they left no room for unwritten Traditions to come into the rule of Faith. This we ſhew unanſwerably, by the Fathers (alledged above, *chap.* 23.) arguing negatively (as *Tertul.* ſometimes) *Non eſt ſcriptum*, therefore not to be received: and ſpeaking excluſively to all things not written, as, that we muſt not ſay or teach any

any thing of faith, *præterquam quod ſcriptum eſt*, ſaith Saint *Auguſtine lib.* 3. *contra Lit Petil. Sine his Teſtibus*, ſaith St. *Chryſoſt.* and *citra Scipturam*, *in Pſal.* 95. and *ab'que authoritate & teſtimonio Scripturæ*, ſaith St. *Hier. in* 1. *cap. Hag.* and, *Quicquid extra Scripturam eſt, cùm non ſit ex fide, peccatum eſt*, *Baſil. in Regulis Eth.* Such excluſive words (*præterquàm*, *ſinè*, *citrà*, *abſq*; , *extrà*) they uſe againſt admitting of unwritten Tradition for a Rule of Faith; which words and ſpeeches are not any way to be eluded.

That they bring many ſayings out of the Fathers for Tradition, it is true, and *Bellarmine* boaſts in the number; but to what purpoſe? when they do but beat the aire, ſtrike us not. For they either meane the Scripture it ſelf, or Evangelical Doctrine contained in, and delivered to the Church by the written Word, to which the name of Tradition is often given by the more ancient Fathers, *Iræn. Tertul. Cyprian*; or elſe they mean the forme of Doctrine and Belief delivered downe in the Church, which though they often call Tradition, yet is it written and contained in Scripture, and is but the explication of it, or the Traditive ſenſe, nothing to the

the unwritten Traditions we ſpeak of; or elſe by unwritten Tradition (as they often mention that too) they imply things of Practiſe, and Rites, and Feſtivals, or Faſts and the like, not matters of Faith neceſſary to Salvation. And among theſe ſome Fathers avouch ſuch for Apoſtolical Traditions which the Romaniſts will not allow, as ſtanding at Prayer between Eaſter and Whitſontide, and every Lords day, and the Trine immerſion in Baptiſm. In a word, where the Fathers ſay, the Apoſtles left ſome things to us unwritten, let the Romaniſts ſhew us, if they can, among all the particulars the Fathers ſpeak of, as ſo left us, any point of Faith neceſſary to ſalvation. Indeed ſome of the more antient Fathers mention one, which (with ſome conſent) they held a point of Faith, and received by Tradition, *viz.* the Millenary belief: but that was not a meer *unwritten Tradition*, but rather a *Traditive ſenſe* of Scripture (*Rev.*20.) and that a miſtaken one, and by the Romaniſts rejected; who know the Fathers were deceived in that Tradition by *Papias*, and we know the Romaniſts are deceived, or may very well in theirs. But let them ſhew, as I ſaid, in all the Teſtimonies of the

the Fathers one of their neceſſary points of Faith among thoſe particulars, which the Fathers have mentioned (with any conſent) as delivered by unwritten Tradition: which ſeeing they cannot doe, all their boaſting of Antiquity in this point is vaine, they meet onely with the *Name* of unwritten Tradition, not the *Thing*.

CHAP. XXVI.

Of the Perſpicuity and Interpretation of Scripture.

THus much of the *Sufficiency of Scripture*. Now of the *Perſpicuity and Interpretation of it*. Scripture being the Rule of Faith, muſt in all reaſon, be both ſufficiently perfect, as wee have heard, and alſo ſufficiently clear and perſpicuous (as we ſhall ſee.) Their pretence of obſcurity and difficulty in Scripture (ſuch as they faſten on it) ſerves them to two purpoſes. To keep people from Reading it, and to ſet up an Infallible Interpreter of the ſenſe of it, or viſible Judge of all controverſies ariſing.

Bellar. handles this buſineſſe in *lib.* 3. *de*

de verbo dei, and propoſes two queſtions, neither of them ſtated aright. His firſt, *Sintne Scripturæ ſacræ per ſe facillimæ & apertiſſimæ, an verò interpretatione indigeant? cap.* 1. His ſecond, *An ab uno viſibili communi judice Scripturæ interpretatio petenda ſit, an unius cujuſque Arbitrio relinquenda?* Whereas we neither ſay, the Scripture needs no Interpretation, nor do we leave it to every mans pleaſure, or judgement. But we acknowledge, there are many hard places, and obſcure paſſages, which need Interpretation; yet is there not ſuch a general obſcurity in Scripture, but that private perſons may read it with profit: which both Scripture it ſelf and all the Fathers exhort the people to: becauſe what is neceſſary to life and faith, is for the moſt part plainly ſet down; therefore it is called *A light to our feet and paths, Pſal.* 119. and *to make wiſe the ſimple, Pſal.* 19.7. and Saint *Peter* bids Chriſtians *attend to the word of Prophecie as a light ſhining in a dark place, 2 Epiſt.* 1.19. *Bell.* anſwers to ſuch places, that the Scripture is a light when it is underſtood: And this is as much as if he had ſaid, a light is a light, if it be ſeen: For a light, if it be not put in a dark Lanthorn,

horn, or under a Bushel (as the Church of *Rome* serves the Scripture to hide it from the people) will shew it self: so will the Scripture, being a light, and a light shining, as S. *Peter* said. Certainly it was the intent and duty of all the Apostles so to speak, and so to write as to be understood. And St. *Peter* notes but some places in Saint *Pauls* Epistles *hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest*— 2 *Epist. c.* 3. Sure then those that are not so, but come with minds and endeavours answerable, may read with profit, seeing his Epistles are for the most part, not hard to be understood.

That which they reply here comes to this, that those Churches to which the Apostle wrote, were instructed aforehand by word of mouth, and so might more easily understand what was written after: We grant, they were præinstructed, and that it made them more fit to understand what was written: but as they had it, so Christian people want it not now; and albeit their præinstruction might prepare them to a more easie understanding of passages relating to some particulars concerning things not necessary to salvation, as was that of Antichrist, 2 *Thes.* 2. Of

which we may be ignorant, and of which the Church of *Rome* is ignorant notwithstanding all her Traditions: yet for things necessary delivered in the Apostles writings (of which the question proceeds) our people have as fitting and sufficient means to understand as they had: For seeing their præinstruction was the first preaching of the Gospel to them, the laying of the foundation, the delivering chiefly of things necessary for them to know unto salvation: I hope we are not destitute of such fore-instruction to fit us for profitable reading of the scriptures, we are taught the principles of Christian Religion, the Catholike Faith into which we and all Christians are baptized: besides, we have the help of the Gospels and all other writings of Gods Word; and therefore why may not our Christian people so preinstructed understand Saint *Pauls* Epistles (in all necessary points) as well and profitably as the people to whom they were written?

Againe, take the Scripture as a Rule of direction, it argues that it must be cleare and plaine in what it is to direct us in. All men give such Rules, as neere as they can, evident and cleare; and shall we deny

deny it to the beſt of Rules, the Rule of Gods making and giving, the Rule of greateſt concernment to us? *Bell.* could ſay (when he meant to give Scripture its due, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 2.) that it was *Regula credendi tutiſſima, certiſſima*: And againe, becauſe it was a Rule, therefore it muſt be *nota & certa*, which indeed is very good reaſon, both for the knowing of it to be our Rule, and for the evidence of it in thoſe things it is to direct us in. In regard of which things, it was neceſſary a Chriſtian ſhould have ſufficient evidence: as in the harder places of Scripture he has his exerciſe, to ſet an edge upon his endeavours, and keep him humble. And theſe very reaſons we finde given by the Fathers for the obſcurity we meet with in Scripture; that it is not ſuch, as to deter any from reading (for the Fathers frequently exhort all unto it) but to ſtirre up the more diligence in ſearching the Scriptures, and to keep down Pride and ſelfe-conceit, that people ſhould not truſt too much to their own underſtanding: but have cauſe to repair upon all occaſions to their Guides and Paſtors, whoſe mouthes preſerve knowledge now, as the Prieſts did under the Law.

As therefore we ſaid, Scripture was a ſufficiently perfect rule of all things neceſſary to ſalvation, containing them expreſly, or deducibly, ſo we ſay it is a ſufficiently cleare Rule, not onely in regard of what it delivers expreſly, but in regard of all neceſſary truths deducible; becauſe they may ſufficiently by evident and cleare conſequence be deduced thence.

This clearneſſe then which (we attribute to Scripture) does not exclude Interpretation, or the skill and induſtry of the Guides of the Church for the deducing of many neceſſary divine Truths. All things neceſſary, we ſay, are there contained expreſly, or thence deducible; and deducible, not all by every one that reads; but it is enough, if done by the Paſtors and Guides, which God appointed in his Church, to that purpoſe, uſing the means that are needfull to that purpoſe: ſuch as is Attention and Diligence in ſearch of the Scripture, collation of places, and obſerving the connexions: alſo ſincerity and impartiality in the collection or deduction they make: alſo prayer and devotion for aſſiſtance in the Work.

Now *Bellarmine* propounded the queſtion

ſtion very careleſly, or enviouſly, as if we denying their viſible Infallible Judge or Interpreter, left the Scripture to be interpreted according to every mans pleaſure. There was enough ſaid above concerning the uſe of Reaſon and Judgement, which we leave to private men, in order to their own aſſent or believing; a private Judgement of diſcerning what is propounded to them, and manifeſted out of Gods Word. Which Judgement of theirs, as it ſuppoſes the help of, ſo it ſtands ſubordinate to the publike Judgement of the Guides and Paſtors, God has ſet in his Church to judge for others, deducing out of Scripture, and manifeſting the truth to every mans conſcience, as 2 *Cor.* 4. 2.

CHAP. XXVII.

Of a viſible Infallible Judge or Interpreter.

NOw the queſtion is, Whether beſides the forementioned Guides and Paſtors, there be One viſible Judge or Interpreter for all the Church, to whoſe ſentence all mens Judgements muſt ſubſcribe,

ſcribe, and every mans conſcience muſt acquieſce without further enquiry? *i. e. a Judge or Interpreter Infallible.*

Indeed ſuch a Judge or Umpire of Chriſtendome would (if to be had) be a ready meanes to compoſe all differences, and reſtore truth and peace. But ſeeing it is onely a pretence and not a reality, we have no ſuch remedy left us: Nay, ſeeing it is pretended to by a Church which may erre as well as other particular Churches, and has erred as groſly, or more than any other, it is the greateſt hinderance now of reſtoring truth and peace among Chriſtians: For that Church which pretends to the Infallibility cannot amend any Errour, and muſt uncharitably condemn all others which doe not acknowledge her for ſuch, as ſhe pretends to be. So that which the Romaniſts would make the ſtay of Chriſtianity (the Infallibility and unerring priviledge of that Church) is the very bane of Chriſtendom.

But to come to the examination and deciſion of this Controverſie. We ſay the Catholike Church of Chriſt is, and will be Infallible in Fundamentals and ſaving Truth neceſſary to the being and con-

continuing of a Church of Christ; and that is no more than to say, The Church shall not faile in being, or in saving Truth, but that in one part or other that saving Truth or Faith will be preserved and professed: But that there is, or shall be a Church of one denomination (as the *Roman*) Infallible in all her definitions, which she proposes *de fide*, is that we deny, and they cannot prove.

We are next to observe, that although the Romanists would usually shroud themselves in this point of Infallibility, under the name of the Church Catholike, yet when brought to the tryal, they must, and doe fasten the Infallibility upon the *Roman* Church; endeavouring to shew by generall markes that the Catholike Church is not to be found but in the Roman Communion (which was observed above, *chap.* 12. to be the drift of Cardinal *Perron*) and here they would willingly stay, and hold forth their Infallibility under the name and priviledge of the Church, being loath to be put upon the Contestation 'twixt the Pope and a Generall Councill. But seeing their Church cannot speak, or doe the office of a Judge or Interpreter, but by a Council

or the Pope, therefore their Infallibility muſt reſt upon the one or other.

And here we muſt obſerve how they ſtand d vided, and diſagree about the very foundation of their Faith, where to ſtate that Infallibility, upon which they profeſs to believe all they doe believe; and for want of which they uſually reproach us Proteſtants, that we cannot have any certainty of belief, or means of agreement: when as they that pretend to ſuch unity and certainty in their belief, differ in the ground-worke of it, one ſide deſtroying and confuting the reaſons and motives of the other.

Now to ſay, as they uſually reply, that they are certaine of the Definitions of their Church, being from Councils confirmed by the Pope, and ſo they have both agreeing. This does not ſalve the buſineſſe. For it is not certain, they ſhall alwaies agree, nor have they alwaies agreed. Where then muſt the Infallibility reſt? What certainty of ſuch definitions as the Council makes without the Pope (ſo did the Councils of *Baſil* and *Conſtance*) or that the Pope makes without a Council? The Romaniſts ſtand divided about the Definitions of thoſe two Coun-

Councils. Againe, if they doe agree, what certainty is there of an Infallibility? For ſtill that muſt accrew to the definitions, either upon the unerring judgement of the Council, making them, or of the Pope confirming them; and ſo it returns to the former difference, and thereupon to the former uncertainty, one ſide deſtroying the reaſons of the other. The *Sorboniſts* and moderate Papiſts on the one part aſſerting, a Council is above the Pope, may judge and depoſe him; on the other part, the *Jeſuits* and more rigid Papiſts maintaining the contrary. And this opinion of ſtating the Infallibility upon the Pope, is the more general among them.

But that we may come to a nearer triall of this Infallibility of Judgement in the Church of *Rome*, and ſee what the certainty of their belief (which by reaſon of that pretended Infallibility, they boaſt of, and deny to us) will come to: Suppoſe then, they are all agreed that in their Church there is ſuch a priviledge of Infallibility, or not erring: Let us conſider what is brought againſt it, what pretended for it.

Their part being the Affirmative, ours

the Negative, we challenge them, that they cannot prove it either by Scripture, or any convincing demonſtrative reaſon: Notwithſtanding they are bound to ſhew us it (according to their own conceſſions) expreſly contained in Scripture: For, they grant all things neceſſary for all to believe (and ſuch they hold this point of Infallibility) are ſo contained in Scripture, it being one of their *prima credibilia*, and neceſſary for all to be believe. *vid. c.* 22. We, as Negatives, are proved, ſhew it is not imaginable, that a belief of that conſequence (the ground-worke of all Faith, the ſtay of the Church, as they will have it) ſhould be ſo ill provided for. That,

Firſt, the four Evangeliſts writing the Goſpel of Chriſt for the uſe of the Church, and all Believers, ſhould, if they knew it, be ſo ſilent of it, and yet record many things of far ſmaller importance.

Secondly, that Saint *Paul*, when he had occaſion to ſpeak it, as when he wrote to the Romans, ſhould not give the leaſt hint of this priviledge, no not when he told them the priviledge of the Jews, *cap.* 3. *that to them were committed the Oracles*

cles of God: How convenient had it been to have ſpoken this priviledge of the Romans, that to them were entruſted the Oracles of Chriſt, and the interpretation of them? Again, when writing to the *Corinthians*, he had occaſion to tell them of ſome, ſaying, *I am of Paul, I of Cephas, I of Apollo*, in ſtead of telling them, All muſt hold of *Cephas* (as the Roman Church has defined it of neceſſity to ſalvation to be ſubject to the Roman Biſhop the ſucceſſor of *Cephas*) he chides them for ſuch faction and diviſion. Or when he and Saint *Peter* agreed upon a diſtribution of their Miniſtry, that one ſhould apply himſelfe to the *Jews*, the other to the *Gentiles*, nothing ſhould be acknowledged of Saint *Peters* Univerſal Juriſdiction, *Gal.* 2. Or when he reckoned up the ſeverall Orders as God had ſet them in his Church, *Epheſ* 4. 11. it ſhould not been ſaid, Firſt *Peter*, then the Apoſtles, but *Firſt Apoſtles, Secondarily Prophets*, and after for ordering Miniſters of the Church, it ſhould be added, *ſome Paſtors and Teachers*, without any inſinuation, that the Lord had given the Biſhop of *Rome* to be ſupream Paſtor, and Doctor of the Church.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, that St. *Peter* himſelfe giving all diligence (as he ſaith *Epiſt.2.cap.1.*) to minde them of what was needfull before his departure, ſhould not tell them whom they were to follow after he was gone.

Fourthly, that we ſhould have ſo often warning of falſe Teachers (both in the Goſpels and Epiſtles) and nothing of this Remedy: So much of Antichriſts, and nothing of the Vicar of Chriſt.

Fifthly, that the *Aſian* Biſhops in their oppoſition againſt Pope *Victor*, or that *Cyprian* and the *African* Biſhops in their oppoſition to Pope *Stephen*, ſhould not know this priviledge of the Church of *Rome*, or not acknowledge it. If it be ſaid, Both *Victor* and *Stephen* judged right: Be it ſo, and let Cardinal *Perron* cry, *Oh Providence, that after-Councils judged the ſame!* (as he *lib.* 3. againſt the *Kings Letter*) yet does it not follow that they were infallible, or had Univerſall Juriſdiction to judge for the whole Church; Nor yet did they judge altogether right; for *Victor* did not judge aright, when he concluded excommunication againſt ſo many famous Biſhops and Churches, upon a different time of obſerving,

ſerving Eaſter; For albeit *Irenæus* and other famous Biſhops and after-Councils acknowledged the truth of the thing it ſelf, *viz.* The obſerving of the Time of Eaſter, yet did they not approve his judgement in proceeding to an Excommunication of, or rather a pronouncing of *Non-communion* with thoſe Churches: And if *Stephen* did generally without exception, as it ſeemes he did, conclude all Heretikes to be received without rebaptization; after-Councils did not *judge the ſame*, but concluded the contrary upon ſome Heretikes; for ſome there were, that did not obſerve, but deſtroyed, what was eſſential to the Form of Baptiſm, and could not therefore be received without being baptized at their admiſſion. Furthermore, that Saint *Auguſtine*, and the Council of *Carthage* ſhould be ſo ill inſtructed in their Faith, as not to know or acknowledge this, but to hold ſo long a conteſtation with the Biſhop of *Rome* in the buſineſſe of Appeales; or that the then Romiſh Biſhops, and their Proctors in that Cauſe, ſhould be ſo ignorant of this point, that in the former buſineſſe they ſhould neither alledge Infallibility of judge-

judgement belonging to the Pope or Church of *Rome*, nor produce any Scripture for what they pleaded for, but onely pretend a Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which upon ſtrict examination could not appeare: for the true Canon of that Councell, which concerned the Pope, did not come home to the buſineſs. But the wits of later ages, eſpecially of this laſt which hath produced Jeſuites, have found out Scripture and reaſon for this Pretended Viſible Univerſall Infallible Judge. We ſhall examine them, but I muſt tell them (which I hinted above) that they are bound to ſhew us it expreſly in Scripture.

For in the former controverſie, *of the ſufficiency of Scripture*, they grant (and muſt needs doe it) that the *Prima Credibilia*, or the *Omnibus Neceſſaria*, are contained expreſly there. Now this of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome* being the firſt thing to be believed by them, the ground and formal reaſon, upon which they believe all things elſe, they are bound to ſhew it expreſly ſet downe in Scripture. And doubtleſſe had there been ſuch a thing intended by our Saviour, he would have left it diſtinctly

ſet

ſet down, that all might be directed to that Infallible Guide or Judge.

Bellar. to ſhew the certainty of their belief above the Proteſtants, delivers, the Propoſition of Faith (as he calls it, *l.* 3. *c.* 10. *de verbo Dei*) in ſuch a ſyllogiſme. *That which is revealed in Scripture is true, But this is revealed in Scripture,*— The firſt propoſition is granted on both ſides: of the ſecond (that this or that is revealed in Scripture) We, ſaith he, are certain. Why? becauſe of the teſtimony of the Church, Council, or Pope, of which we have *apertas promiſſiones*, plain, and clear promiſes in Scripture, that they cannot erre. But the Proteſtants know this or that to be revealed in Scripture by conjectures onely, or the judgement of a private Spirit. So he.

This propoſition of Faith we ſhall ſpeak to bleow, *chap.* 28. Here I mention it, that to ſhew according to the Argument above, they hold themſelves bound to produce cleare Scripture for this ground-work of their Faith; therefore he is forced to call them *apertas promiſſiones.* He names two in that place; the Firſt is from *Acts* 15.28. *Viſum eſt Spiritui ſancto & nobis.*

Anſw.

Anſwer. This if it concerns any thing, belongs to a Council, (therefore *Bellar.* put them all in together, Church, Council, or Pope, for, as I noted above, they are not agreed where to fix) but what promiſe is here to Church or Councel? It is but a relation of what the Apoſtles ſaid, and might ſay it in their privi'edge of Infallibility: and I hope none of the after-Conncils preſumed to ſay it, as they ſaid it. *Bellarmine* was ill adviſed to give us this for a cleare promiſe, which is neither promiſe, nor yet cleare: for how does it appeare by any thing in the Text, how after-Councils might ſpeak ſo? Nay it is cleare they could not ſpeak it upon a priviledge of infallibility. For Councels (as *Bel.* ackdowledges, *l.*2 *de Concil.*) *nec habent, nec ſcribunt revelationes, ſed ex verbo Dei per ratiocinationem deducunt concluſiones. Neither have, nor propound revelations, but draw their Concluſions out of the word of God by diſcourſe.* Now no men ever undertook to deliver Truth infallibly, which they beat out by reaſoning, and concludiug upon diſcurſive meanes: Indeed if *Bellarmine* inſtead or this (*Viſum eſt Spiritui ſancto & nobis*) had givien us that of *Mat.*28. *I am with you to the end,*

or

or that of *John* 16. *The Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth*; he had given us a promiſe, but not cleare: a promiſe of guiding into all truth infallibly; ſo to them that received it then: but not clear for infallibility to after-Councels or Guides of the Church: a promiſe indeed of aſſiſtance to them, for all neceſſary Truth, but yet conditionall, upon their doing their duty in uſing the meanes; which that all or the major part in every Council will do, is not certaine.

His other clear promiſe is our Saviours praying for *Peter*, *Luk.* 22. ver. 32. *Rogavi pro te nè deficiat fides tua*; This may ſeem to concerne the Pope or Church of *Rome*; yet is there nothing in it of a cleare promiſe to them, whether we conſider the thing prayed for, or the perſon; The thing prayed for is the perſevering or not failing of the ſaving faith by which *Peter* was rooted, and built upon CHRIST: which cannot agree to all the Biſhops of *Rome*, for they may want that Faith, or faile in it, as they acknowledge. *Bellarmine* grants this perſeverance was perſonall as to *Peter*; but ſaith hee, there is another thing promiſed

miſed which belongs to his Succeſſors, *viz.* That none in his Chair ſhould teach againſt the Faith. So *lib.*4.*de Pont.cap.*3. or that the Biſhop of *Rome*, *docens è cathedra*, cannot erre. So *lib.* 3. *de verbo Dei cap.*5. But how is this a clear promiſe now? or how can this be wreſted out of that our Saviour prayed for to *Peter*, by any force of reaſon? For thus the one muſt follow on the other. *Peter* had aſſurance to perſevere in Faith, therefore all his Succeſſours (Biſhops of *Rome*) have aſſurance infallibly to teach nothing againſt the Catholike Faith, which is moſt incohærent. For if that which was directly prayed for (*Peters* perſeverance) does not deſcend to his Succeſſors, how ſhall the conſequent of it? Nay how ſhall that which is altogether inconſequent to it, therefore deſcend unto them? For were it granted that they ſhould perſevere in ſaving-faith (the thing aſſured to *Peter*) yet would it by no meanes follow they cou'd not erre: No more than it is true of every regenerate man perſevering, that he is infallible; but now it is granted they have no aſſurance of ſuch perſeverance in the faith, yet muſt it follow they have aſſurance of teaching no-

nothing againſt it. Thus far then it is ſo clear a promiſe, that nothing ſeems more unreaſonable.

Againe, if they would make it any way agree to the Biſhops of *Rome*, it muſt be thus, Our Saviour prayed for *Peter*, that his Faith ſhould not faile, though he denyed him thrice, therefore *Peters* ſucceſſors, though they deny the Faith in mouth, yet it ſhall not faile in heart (as they ſay it was with Pope *Liberius*, when he ſubſcribed to the *Arrians*.) But then this is clean contrary to what they would have out of it, which is an outward Profeſſing or declaring of the Faith by definitive ſentence, whatever the perſwaſion of the heart be: this they contend not for; yet this is that which was promiſed to *Peter*, this he had; the other (*viz.* outward profeſſion) he failed in. So clear yet is this promiſe. But now looke at the perſon, were there any thing here prayed for which might fit the Infallibility which the Biſhops of *Rome* would have, yet what cleare conſequence can make that belong to them which St. *Peter* had? can they give us one place of Scripture to aſſure us infallibly that *Peter* was at *Rome*, and governed that Church as the

the Biſhop of it, and dyed in that Sea? Is it not admirable that this ground-work of all their faith ſhould no where appeare in all Scripture? The Eccleſiaſtical Writers indeed took him to be as Biſhop in that Sea, and ſo the Fathers generally ſpeake of him. But this amounts onely to a humane Teſtimony; and beſides they aſcribe the foundation and Government of that Church to Saint *Paul*, together with *Peter*; and Saint *Paul* we finde in Scripture to have written to the Church of *Rome*, to preach to them, and dwell among them, yet muſt the pretenſions made from S. *Peter* be cleare notwithſtanding. Well, were this cleare by Divine Teſtimony, that the Biſhops of *Rome* are S. *Peters* peculiar ſucceſſors; yet ſtill there is no ground for their beliefe of Infallibility, unleſſe they can ſhew it clearly, that what belonged to Saint *Peter* (as to this point) is derived to all his ſucceſſors; and that the ſucceſſors of other Apoſtles in the Churches they founded and govern'd, muſt not enjoy what belonged to thoſe Apoſtles.

So much of theſe two cleare promiſes of *Bell.* had he had clearer, we ſhould doubt-

doubtleſſe have heard of them. One place there is, which is often in their mouths, and ſerves for all purpoſes: for the Headſhip and univerſall Juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Rome*, for the Infallibility of Pope, Councils, and Church of *Rome*: and that is, *Mat.* 16. *Thou art Peter and upon this Rock*—here the Church muſt be built upon Saint *Peter*, that's it they contend for. Cardinal *Perron* is much upon it (*lib.* 4. *cap.* 3.) and though that which he would there work out of it, is not expreſly Infallibility, but univerſall Juriſdiction or Headſhip, yet becauſe they both have the like foundation upon this place, it will be worthy to obſerve how he raiſes his worke upon it, by a witty indeed, but miſtaken phanſie. Thus it is, The Fathers at firſt did for the moſt part ſpeake of the Church here as built upon Saint *Peter*, afterward they did generally interpret it of the Confeſſion of *Peter*, that the Church was built on that. Now the Cardinall will have theſe interpretations not to exclude, but inferre one the other, thus. The Church was built *cauſally* on the Confeſſion of *Peter*, *formally* on *Peter* himſelfe, or the Miniſtery of his perſon,

perſon, *i. e. Peters* Confeſſion was the cauſe why our Saviour choſe him to lay the Foundation of the Miniſtry of his Church upon him. Now judge of the miſtake, in running upon *Peters confeſſing*, inſtead of *Peters confeſsion*, *i.e.* the Faith which *Peter* confeſſed and uttered. For *Peters confeſſion* (as the Card. takes it in the notion of a meritorious cauſe) was a ſingle and tranſient act of that Faith which was in *Peter*, a Grace or Virtue; it was a *confeſſing*; but *Peters Confeſſion*, as the Fathers take it, when they ſay the Church was built on it, is underſtood materially, for the thing or truth confeſſed by *Peter*, *viz. Chriſt the Son of God*; the Confeſſion, or Faith required of the Eunuch at his Baptiſme, *Act.* 9. That he thus miſtakes, it appears alſo by his illuſtrating of it by the ſaying of St. *Hierome*, that *Peter walked not upon the waters, but Faith; which* (ſaith the Cardinal) *is not to deny that* Peter *did formally in perſon walk, but to ſhew the cauſe of his walking*, viz. *Faith, which he gave to the word of Chriſt*; where plainly Faith is taken for a Grace, Virtue, or Act of *Peters*. Now if we ſay the Church is built upon *Peters* Faith, will he ſay that

that Faith there is an Act or Virtue in *Peter*, or not rather taken for that Catholike truth believed and confeſſed by *Peter*? *Peters* confeſſion of that Faith was no queſtion the cauſe that our Saviour beſtowed ſomething on him at that time: but that on which Chriſt ſayes there, He will build his Church, was *Peters* Confeſſion, *i. e.* the Faith or Truth confeſſed by him; and ſo its plaine the Fathers tooke it, for they oppoſed this Faith or Confeſſion (as the Cardinal acknowledges) againſt the Arrians, That *Chriſt was the Sonne of the living God.*

Bell. applyes the promiſe following (*I will give thee the Keys*, &c.) to this buſines of the One viſible Interpreter or Judge, and will have (*whatſoever thou looſeſt*) to ſignifie not onely the relaxation of ſins, and their cenſures, but *nodos omnes legum—& dogmatum*—the diſpenſing with the tyes of Laws, and the explicating all the doubts and difficulties of Doctrine and Controverſie, *lib.* 3. *de verbo Dei cap.* 5. And this is barely ſaid by him without further proof. Now when this promiſe of the Keyes is applyed to judgement about ſinnes and offences, we know what

bind-ng

binding is as well as *looſing*; but when it is thus ſtretched to univerſall judgement in the interpretation of Scripture, defining points of faith, diſpenſing with Lawes we cannot tell, unleſſe we thus inferre, that as *looſing* her with *Bell.* is to explicate Scripture, ſo *binding* muſt be the obſcuring or involving the ſenſe of it; if *looſing* be againe the power of diſpenſing with Lawes, which binde men (as in point of marriage or the like) then of *binding* muſt be the forbidding of what God has made lawfull, as for Clergy to marry, or what he has commanded, as people to receive the Sacrament in both kindes. And the Pope it ſeems by vertue of this promiſe or power of Keyes may thus *looſe*, and *binde*, and not erre: yet theſe are their chiefe places of Scripture. Now let us come to their Reaſons.

Firſt is from Gods providence, who was not ignorant how many difficulties, and controverſies would ariſe about the faith, and therefore would no doubt appoint ſuch a Judge. *Anſw.* This is to meaſure the wiſdome of God by the modell of our Reaſon: but the ſame reaſon may alſo tell us, it would have been more convenient for the Church to have had ſuch an In-

Infallible Judge or Interpreter in every Nation, than one for the whole Church, which was to be ſpread over all the Earth; yea reaſon may further tell us, it had been ſuitable to his providence, expreſly to have told us, who that Infallible Judge was, and where we ſhould finde him. And it cannot be imagined in reaſon, but he would have done it, had he appointed any ſuch; for he was not ignorant, that many & the greateſt controverſies would be about this Judge.

He tells us plainly, *There muſt be Hereſies:* and the end wherefore; *that they which are approved may be manifeſt*, 1 *Cor.* 11. but not appointing withall this remedy of an Infallible Judge; we muſt think it is, that approved faith may be of more price, and worth; *gained* with more earneſt enquirie, and diligence in ſearching the Scripture, & uſing the like means: ſo alſo *kept and held* with greater care and watchfulneſſe; all which would have faln and grown remiſſe in the hearts of men, if to truſt all their belief upon an Infallible Guide, without any further enquirie.

Chap. XXVIII.

Of certainty of belief, and whether they or we have better means for it.

THe Second reaſon is from certainty of belief, which they ſay the Proteſtants cannot have for want of ſuch Infallibility: but *we are certain* (ſaith *Bell:* in his Propoſition of Faith above-mentioned §.27.) *that this or that is revealed in Scripture, becauſe of the Teſtimony of the Church, Councel, or Pope, which cannot erre:*

Now would I ask, firſt, whether they believe, that *Chriſt is the Son of God, Saviour of the world,* that *He ſuffered,* and *now ſits at the right hand of God,* or the like; becauſe the Church teſtifies it to be revealed in Scripture, or becauſe they ſee it evidently there themſelves. If they ſay, becauſe the Church teſtifies it; then it ſeems they cannot (which is falſe) or may not (which is worſe) believe God immediately, when he ſpeaks as plain as the Church can. If they ſay, becauſe they ſee it evidently there, then have they two formall reaſons of their belief, One, the immediate evidence of Scripture: The other,

other, the Teſtimony of the Church. And if they can believe upon that immediate evidence or light of Scripture, then ſo may we alſo. And ſo we doe, not excluding the light which the Church gives to the Scripture, where it needs; which light is not to us the reaſon of believing what we believe, but a means and help to ſee that which is contained in Scripture, and make it more evident to us.

Again, I would ask, how they believe it to be revealed in Scripture, that the Church is Infallible? becauſe of the Teſtimony of the Church? No, that they cannot ſay here, but muſt alledge for it plain Scripture (*apertas promiſſiones, clear promiſes*, as *Bellar:* called them) and muſt allow men the uſe of their reaſon & judgment, upon the evidence of them. Well, if they may believe that great point, of the Infallibility of their Church, upon immediate evidence of Scripture, why may not we believe other points ſo too? or why doe they condemn the Proteſtants for believing every point of Religion upon the ſame ground, on which they themſelves lay all their faith at once? for they believe the Churches Infallibility revealed in Scripture, becauſe they ſee it, as

they ſay plainly promiſed there. Now if they believing the Infallibility of their Church upon immediate evidence of Scripture can have certainty of belief: why cannot we have like certainty upon the like evidence? if they cannot have certainty in that particular, then can they not have any certainty in any thing elſe, which they believe, upon that belief of an Infallibility in their Church. Onely this they get by it, and muſt anſwer for it one day, that believing all things elſe upon the ſuppoſed Infallibility of their Church, they are made to believe many things to be revealed in Scripture, and to be the will of God, which are not; yea, to believe contrary to that which is revealed, as the *half communion* for the people.

Again, they that underſtood and believed what the Apoſtles preached, and wrote to them, did it without the externall means of an Infallible Interpreter, upon the evidence of what was ſpoken or written: and therefore ſo may we. Now to ſay, They that ſpoke and wrote were Infallible, and the other knew it to be ſo, is no more than what we ſay, Scripture is Infallible, that ſpeaks to us the ſame

which

which they ſpoke and wrote, and therefore we way as well underſtand and believe it upon the ſame evidence.

We doe not here (as I inſinuated before) exclude the exterior helps & means which God has appointed for interpreting and clearing the Scriptures, ſuch as definitions of Councels, the judgment and practice of Primitive Ages, the skill and labour of the preſent Guides of the Church, which make for the clearing and evidencing of that which is contained in Scripture; but upon the evidence of that, or manifeſtation of the truth, out of that, is the ſtay or laſt reſolution of our Faith. *Waldenſis*, a learned writer in the Church of *Rome* many years agoe, with divers others, doe well apply that of the Samaritans to the Wowan (*Now we believe, for we have heard him our ſelves, Joh.* 4. 42.) unto this laſt reſolution of Faith beginning in the Teſtimony of the Church, as the firſt motive, but ending and ſtaying upon Scripture; As they were firſt moved and brought to Chriſt upon the Womans ſaying, but believed indeed when they heard him themſelves: So the ſaying and judgment of the Church at our firſt coming and after is a great motive, and

light to us; but then indeed we believe when we hear him our ſelves; when we hear him ſpeak thus and thus to us in Scripture.

Now he that upon carefull and impartiall uſing the means God has appointed, does ſearch for the Truth, ſhall finde what he ſeeks, or not erre inpardonably: whereas the Romaniſt, receiving all upon a ſuppoſed infallible Teſtimony, ſeeks no further comes not to *(audivimus ipſi, we have heard him our ſelves)* blindly caſts his faith upon a falſe ground, and ſo is led to believe (as I ſaid) many things as revealed of God, which are not, and ſometimes the contrary to what is revealed.

Their third Reaſon is from pretence of Unity; which they ſay is preſerved amongſt them by this means, but loſt among the Proteſtants for want of it; and they inſtance in the breaches, and confuſions of theſe our Times. *Anſw.* We had the ſame means for Unity which the Antient Church had(as was ſaid above, *ch.* 13.) and ſo long as we could freely uſe them (having the ſecular power to friend) *hereſie* and *ſchiſme* was prevented, and Unity preſerved: but when the ſword of violence

lence prevailed, no marvail if Licentiouſneſſe grew bold, and caſt off the cords of obedience Eccleſiaſtical, as well as Civil. And we ſee this pretended Infallibility could not keep *Burbon* and his Army in order, but that they ſacked *Rome*, made the Pope their priſoner, and forced him to unworthy conditions. And we read that Hereticks of old (as Arrians, and others) when they had the Emperours favour, bore down all before them; ſo that this means of Infallibility either could not keep them from breaking out, and prevailing, or elſe (which indeed is the truth) there was no ſuch belief of an Infallibility in the Church of *Rome* in thoſe better Ages: nor was it ever made uſe of, or alledged againſt Hereticks to repreſs them. The judgment indeed of the Biſhops of *Rome* was often alledged, as was alſo the judgment of other Churches and famous Biſhops, but this without implying an Infallibity in judging.

Nay this pretence of Infallibility is ſo farre from being cauſe of Unity in the Catholick Church, that it has been the chief cauſe of diviſion, and of loſing more than they retain by it. The Greek Church ſtands diſ-joyned from the Roman, be-

cauſe of her challenging Univerſal ſubjection and Infallibility; and therefore no more to be dealt with. And this has loſt all thoſe that in theſe later Ages have been divided from the Communion of the Roman Church, becauſe the pretenſe of Infallibility made her incorrigible, and cut off all hopes of her amending the errors they complained of, and deſired to have reformed. So that let them caſt up what they have loſt, and they will have no cauſe to boaſt of what they hold by it.

Nay did the Romaniſts truly confeſſe what belief they have of this Infallible Judge, it would in all probability be found, that not the faith of ſuch Infallibility, but the fear of Inquiſition, fire and faggot, keeps thoſe they have in obedience, at leaſt external.

But ſome of them have ſaid, This Rule or way, if followed, does produce Unity: but the Proteſtants Rule of belief is not apt to doe it, but rather begets diviſion. *Anſw.* It is true that their Infallibility (though not Real but pretended) where it is followed, *i. e.* indeed believed, will produce, according to the ſtrength of erroneous perſwaſions, an anſwerable effect in

in thoſe that are drawn to believe it: for ſuch muſt needs ſubmit to all things elſe. But being onely pretended, not reall, it cannot be apt to produce the effect, or hold men to them, but as we ſaid, has loſt many. Our Rule of believing upon evidence of Scripture, (gained by due uſe of the means appointed thereunto, (as above mentioned, in this *Chap.*) if conſcionably followed, will produce the effect of Unity and peaceable ſubmiſſion, and is more apt to do it. For therfore was Scripture given, that there might be *one Faith*: and certainly not given with ſuch obſcurity, as to make men quarrel, but with ſuch evidence, as men not wanting to themſelves, may therby come to know that *one faith*, without ſuch a viſible Infallible Judge. And when any will deceive themſelves and prove obſtinate, the Church proceeds to reſtrain them by Eccleſiaſtical cenſure, even to excommunication, for preſerving Unity in the reſt. And other means the Antient Church had not, nor can the Roman goe farther in the way of the Church: for as for fire and faggot, it was the way of the Adverſaries of the Church.

The Teſtimonies they cite out of Fathers are all not concluding; They are

ſuch as ſend Hereticks to the Church in general, as S. *Auguſtine* doth the Donatiſts often: but this does not argue, that we ſhall finde any where in the Church a Viſible Infallible Guide. Otherwiſe we ſay, in every Church there are Güides and Paſtors of publik judgment, to whom inferiours muſt ſubmit, and the conſent of the Catholick Church is above that. Or elſe they are ſuch Teſtimonies, as report the judgment of the Biſhop of *Rome* given in ſuch or ſuch cauſes, and required by other Biſhops or Churches. But this comes not home neither. For we finde the judgment of other Biſhops, and learned Fathers alledged, and required, and that by Popes themſelves. So was *Athanaſius* his judgment, deſired by *Liberius*, and *Hieromes* often by Pope *Damaſus*; and that in matter of doctrinal points, and with a great deal of ſubmiſſion to their judgment, as to be guided by it; (as appears in Pope *Liberius* Letter to *Athanaſius*, and *Damaſus* to *Hierome.*)

One place of *Irenæus* is much cited by them, *Ad quam propter potentiorem principalitatem, &c.* lib. 3. cap. 2. which indeed makes againſt them: For this implies neither Univerſal juriſdiction, nor

nor Infallibility in the Romiſh Church: Neither did *Irenæus* mean ſo much as the words by reaſon of the ill Latine Tranſlation, may ſeem to imply. For the Greek had it, (as I have met with it, and as the whole Context avouches it) ἱκανωτέραν ἀρχὴν, and is ill tranſlated *potentiorem principalitatem*, but rather ſounds *propter convenientiorem inſtitutionem, ſeu principium*; That Church being from Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul*, and therefore the moſt convenient example to ſhew the ſucceſſion of Paſtors and Doctrine. For from thence he fetches his argument to confute thoſe Hereticks, that being preſſed with Scripture did accuſe it (as he ſaith) of obſcurity, as not to be underſtood of them who were ignorant of Tradition; therefore he confutes them by the undeniable ſucceſſion of the Churches, and becauſe *Longum eſt* (ſaith he) *omnium Eccleſiarum enumerare ſucceſſiones*, therefore he ſingles out the Roman, as that which was *maxima, omnibus cognita & à glorioſiſſimis Apoſtolis Petro & Paulo fundata & inſtituta*, (there is the ἱκανωτέραν ἀρχὴν, *a more convenient beginning of ſucceſſion* in that, than in other leſſe famous Churches) and by the doctrine received

ceived from the Apoſtles, and delivered down in that Church, he confounds the Hereticks. Now (ſaith he) with this Church (becauſe of ſuch a beginning and ſucceſſion) every Church ought to agree: and ſo they did then, and therefore it was needleſſe for him to inſtance in any other Church.

Thus are we alſo willing to deal with the Romaniſts at this day. They being preſſed with Scripture, accuſe it of obſcurity, and ſay, (as thoſe Hereticks that *Irenæus* had to deal with) It is not to be underſtood by them that are ignorant of Tradition; We therefore tell them of the Doctrine of Faith delivered down in all Churches, and bring them to the Antient Roman Church, which was glorious then for its foundation and preſervation of true doctrine, and tell them, becauſe of ſuch an ἐκκλησίαν ἀρχαίαν, they ought to agree with it now: which they doe not in the main points between us and them controverted (as aboveſaid) and in this particular of an Infallible Univerſal Judge for the whole Church.

¶ Thus farre we have proceeded upon the firſt and chief Rule of Triall, *Scripture*; *the Sufficiency and Evidence of it*. Now to the other.

Chap. XXIX.
Of Conſent of Antiquity.

OUr ſecond Rule of Triall, is, *Conſent of Antiquity*. We ſay, the Romaniſts cannot prove their Doctrines by that, as they ought to doe, if they will have them paſſe for Catholick; for then according to *Vincentius* his Rule, *ſemper & ubique*, they muſt be alwaies and generally held in the Church. Yet is there a pretence made to it, and great confidence and boaſting among them of the Fathers: not that they know, they have indeed advantage by them, as to the due proving of their cauſe, but becauſe the Proteſtants have freely and ingenuouſly ſpoken their Judgment of the Fathers and their authority. Therefore the Romaniſts make advantage of it with their own Proſelytes, as if the Proteſtants declined all Triall that way. Now ſhould we ſpeak with that liberty of the Fathers writings, as they doe of the Scripture, loading it with imputations of obſcurity, imperfection, corruptions, &c. it might I hope be ſo much more juſtifiable in us, as the divine authority of Scripture ſurpaſſes all humane writings. But

But this we profeſſe, however they are obliged to diſparage the written Word of God (and a miſerable cauſe it muſt be which obliges men to ſuch a plea) yet are not we obliged to detract any thing from the due worth of the Antient Fathers: for, take their Writings as they are, we averre that the Popiſh faith cannot prove it ſelf to be Catholick by them.

Yet if we ſay, the Fathers were men, and ſubject to error, which the Scripture is not, we doe but ſay, what they oft acknowledge themſelves. If we ſay, they have erred in ſeveral Ages, and that many of them together with a general conſent (as in the Millenary belief, the Infant communion, and the place of faithfull Souls out of Heaven till the Day of Judgment) we doe but ſay, what the Romaniſt cannot deny, who doe acknowledge the Fathers erred in theſe.

If therefore we ſay, they are no Rule of Faith to us, we doe but ſay, what they of the Ages following thought, that they were not bound to follow them in theſe errors, after they were once detected, and what the Romaniſts muſt acknowledge, for they alſo have forſaken them in theſe.

If

If again we ſay, the Writings of the Fathers have come through ill hands unto us, which have corrupted or maimed the true, and patched falſe and ſuppoſititious writings to them, the Romaniſts cannot but acknowledge, we have great cauſe to think there was more providence of God in the preſerving of Scripture entire, than the Writings of the Fathers. Onely here is the miſchief again, they are obliged to ſpeak any caſualty that happens to Scripture, and to make a noiſe of corruptions, obſcurity, &c. becauſe they finde it too plain againſt them, and are afraid the people ſhould ſee it too; but of the Fathers writings more rarely doe they acknowledge any ſuch thing, not becauſe they have cauſe to joy of them, as plain and full for the Romiſh faith; but becauſe their advantage is by their forged writings, and the corruptions of the true ones; alſo becauſe thoſe writings came through their hands for ſeveral Ages, and ſo the falſe dealing, that has been uſed, becomes chargeable upon the profeſſors of their cauſe: Falſe dealing I ſay, what by the cunning of Monks that had thoſe Writings in Manuſcript, what by their ſeveral editions of the Fathers, what by

by their expurgatory Indexes. In all which it is eaſie to ſee what labouring there has been, to make the Antients ſpeake the Language of their preſent Church. Hence have they advantage, not truly, by the Writings of the Antients, but ſuch as ſerves to their purpoſe, eſpecially when to deal with thoſe that are leſſe learned; whom they can turn to this or that place in ſuch or ſuch a Father, knowing they are not able to judge whether the writing be ſuppoſititious, or the place corrupted, or whether the ſame Father elſwhere expreſſes himſelf otherwiſe, or be contradicted by other Fathers, and there ſpeaks onely his private opinion.

This caution *Vincentius* gives us in his Rules for Catholick doctrine, *cap.* 39. Whatever any, *quamvis ſanctus, doctus, Epiſcopus, Martyr, præter— vel contra—* though holy, learned, though a Biſhop or Martyr, holds beſide or againſt the reſt of the Fathers: *id inter proprias & privatas opiniunculas—* it muſt be ſevered from the Publick doctrine, and placed among private opinions.

Well, though all this makes for the diſadvantage of the Proteſtants, that they have not the Fathers writings, as they came

came from their own hands and pens, but as through the hands of many Adverſaries: yet take them as they are, with all the difficulties of finding what is truly theirs, and what is the ſenſe of it, the Proteſtants never doubted to enter this kinde of triall by Antiquity; not ſtanding or falling by every thing we meet with in one or moe Fathers, (for the Romaniſts will not ſo) but maintaining:

1: That the Romaniſt cannot prove his Affirmative by a full and ſufficient conſent or Teſtimony of Antiquity.

2. That we have enough in the writings of Antiquity to diſcover the novelty of the Romiſh doctrines, which may generally appeare upon this evidence.

Chap. XXX.

Application of the Rule to their Doctrine in ſeveral points.

Firſt, the great *ſilence* in the writings of the firſter Ages, touching the points of Romiſh faith; which cannot be imagined would have been, if ſuch had been the doctrine of the Church, or the faith that

that all Christians were to learn and hold; they call to us, to name Professors of the Protestant doctrine in all Ages, but that is unreasonable we should be bound to it (our part being the Negative of what they erroneously affirm) yea, and impossible too, because the errors we deny, were not affirmed or thought of in many Ages; and how then should any expresly appear against them? But it is most reasonable and just, to exact of thē, who affirm *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, *half-Communion*, *Image Worship*, *&c.* for Catholick doctrines, to shew and prove them professed in all Ages: at least so profound a Silence as we finde in the first Ages, is sufficient argument against them, yea and Silence when there was occasion to vouch and defend them, had they been the doctrines of the Christian Church.

As when we see so many Apologies written and declaring the faith and practice of the Church; so many Books purposely written on that subject, *Epiphanius* wrote two, his *Ancoratus de fide Christiana*, and his *Compendium fidei Catholicæ Ecclesiæ*, S. *Augustine* wrote three, one *De vera Religione*, where he sayes at the

the beginning, *hæc eſt noſtris temporibus Chriſtiana Religio*, Another *De doctrina Chriſtiana*, and his *Enchiridion* to *Laurentius*, of which he ſaith, *ibi diligenter mihi videor complexus quo modo colendus ſit Deus*; in which only he has one thing ſounding to the Popiſh doctrine,& that is about helping the dead by Almes, or Sacrifice, and that was but his private opinion grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſal, not of Purgatory, but of common receptacles of all mens ſouls out of Heaven till the Day of Judgment, in the 109 Chapter of that Book. For that which he ſaith in the 70 Chap. *Per Eleëmoſynas de peccatis præteritis propitiandus eſt Deus*, he qualifies himſelf in the ſame place, and excellently ſpeaks of the free reward of Good works in the 107 Chap. Now can it be Imagined that in ſuch Books purpoſely written, there ſhould be ſuch ſilence and pretermiſſion of the Romiſh doctrines of Faith, had they been the Doctrine of the Church?

Again, in the firſt 300 years, when there was ſuch occaſion to urge and hold up their *publick Penance* and *Satisfaction* by it, alſo ſo much written and ſpoken about it; had they believed a Romiſh

Purgatory

Purgatory after this life, can we think but they would often have mentioned it alſo, and told the people of the pains they ſhould undergoe there, if not careful to perform due *Penance* and *Satisfaction* here?

Alſo when occaſion was given by Adverſaries to aſſert ſuch doctrines, had the Church known and profeſſed them: can it be imagined thoſe Fathers that anſwered thoſe Adverſaries ſhould be ſilent in the Cauſe? As for example, In the point of *Tranſubſtantiation*, when *Marcion* affirmed CHRIST had a body phantaſtick or in appearance onely, how obvious had it been for him (had Tranſubſtantiation been the doctrine of the Church) to have objected, that the ſigne of his Body in the Euchariſt, was but a body in appearance, the ſhew of bread onely, and his body there under any ſhape, figure, &c. how neceſſary had it been for the Church to have maintained that point againſt him? it could not have eſcaped the diſputation, had it been any doctrine of faith in the Church. Whereas on the contrary, *Tertullian* takes it for granted, that the bread (which was the figure of his body) was a true body, and thence infers

that

that Chriſts body (of which bread was the figure) was alſo true and real, *l.*4. *contra Marc. c.* 40. So when the *Eutichians* affirmed the converſion of the Humane nature into the Divine, and drew ſome phraſes of the Doctors of the Church (which ſeemed to imply a converſion of the bread after conſecration) to the proving or illuſtrating of it: had the doctrine of the Church been ſo, could they have declined the expreſſe maintenance of Tranſubſtantiation againſt that argument? whereas on the contrary we ſee the *Eutychians* confuted by *Theodoret*, *Gelaſius* and others, by denying plainly a ſubſtantial converſion of the bread, and ſo taking away the ground of the argument, and all belief of Tranſubſtantiation.

So in the point of *Invocation* and *Worſhip of Saints*, when it was objected to *Origen* by *Celſus* in defence of the Heathen Invocating their *Dæmons* & *Heroes* (whom they held to be *Internuncios & intermedios*, betwixt the ſupreme God and themſelves) that the Chriſtians alſo allowed the miniſtery of Angels, and that their Saints departed were *Amici Dei*. Had the Church then held Invocation

of

of Angels or Saints departed, *Origen* had been bound to aſſert and maintain it, and not to anſwer as he doth, that Chriſtians invocated God only by their high Prieſt *JESUS CHRIST*, and they that doe ſo, want not the Miniſtery or help of Angels, in his 8 Book againſt *Celſus*, and elſwhere. The very like does S. *Auguſt:* ſpeak of the Heathen *Dæmons* and *Heroes* in his 8, & 9 books *de Civ: Dei.* Shewing, the *Chriſtians* did not ſo to the *Martyrs.* And when it was objected to him by *Fauſtus* the *Manichæan*, that inſtead of the heathen Idols they had ſet up the Martyrs, becauſe they reſorted to their Monuments, and there offered up prayers and ſacrifice: Had the Church then held the Romiſh belief and practice of *Saint-Worſhip* and *Invocation*, could he have declined the maintenance of it? whereas he there and elſewhere diſclaims it in expreſſe terms, and ſhews *Fauſtus* his miſtake, in the end and purpoſe of the Chriſtians reſorting to Martyrs Tombs, which was to offer up the Sacrifice, and worſhip and prayers to God onely, *lib.* 20. *contra Fauſt.*

Laſtly, when the Invocating of Chriſt was uſed by the Church as an argument fo

for his Godhead againſt the Arrians, would it have been good, if Invocating of Saints alſo had been the doctrine and practice of the Church? and if that ſhift of the Romaniſts had then been allowable, that they doe not invocate Saints as God, or with invocation which is due to God, but as friends of God and excellent inſtruments of his glory, had not the Arrians had a pat anſwer to the former argument, *viz:* That Chriſt was to be invocated, yet not as God, but as the Son of God, after a more excellent way than any other creature is? But they that uſed the former argument feared no ſuch anſwer, becauſe Invocation and worſhip of Saints was then no doctrine of the Church.

Thus much for the *ſilence* of the Fathers when occaſion was given them to defend thoſe points, had they been doctrines of the Church.

Secondly, we have Evidence againſt the Roman faith, by that which we meet with in the Fathers appliable to ſome points of it.

1. Sometimes we meet with the *Name* indeed which the Romiſh point bears, but not the *Thing*; as for example, in ſome few

few Fathers, there is mention of a *purging fire* after this life; but neither doe they agree upon the ſame thing among themſelves, nor any of their conceits with that thing the Romaniſts call *Purgatory*. So we meet with the name of *Oblation* and *Sacrifice* in the Euchariſt, but in ſenſes we admit of, not the Roman thing of a *proper Sacrifice*. So we meet with *prayers for the dead*, which indeed was the doctrine and practice of the firſter Ages, but it was not for relief of any Souls in a ſuppoſed purgatory, to which the Romiſh doctrine and practice of praying for the dead is bound. So for *private confeſſion*, we allow it in the ſenſe and way the Antient Church did perſwade and ſometimes practice it, not as impoſed and practiſed by the Roman.

2. Sometimes we meet with *phraſes* in the Fathers favouring ſome Romiſh doctrine, but then we ſhew by argument and reaſon from the ſame Fathers, that thoſe phraſes doe not ſpeak indeed the *Romiſh ſenſe*. As for *Tranſubſtantiation*, many hyperbolicall expreſſions, many ſpeeches ſounding the change and Tranſelementation of the Bread; but we ſhew they could not mean a ſubſtantial change, becauſe

becauſe we finde them uſe like phraſes of the change of a Man in regeneration, of Water in Baptiſm, of Oyle in the Chriſm after conſecration; in all which no ſubſtantial change or converſion. Alſo becauſe many of the Fathers in plain terms acknowledge, *This is my Body*, to be a figurative ſpeech; and becauſe it is clearly evinced out of them, that indeed they *held* the Bread remained in ſubſtance after conſecration. One inſtance whereof we had above, in this Chap: in their anſwer to the Eutychians. Another we may have from their ſaying, our bodies to be nouriſhed by the Body of Chriſt, and to receive increaſe by it. *Bellarmine* here acknowledges an hyperbolical improper ſpeech, and that they meant our bodies *ex contactu corporis Chriſti* did receive a diſpoſition to immortality; a figurative ſpeech indeed, taking the body of Chriſt ſacramentally, and ſpeaking of it what the ſacramental element does indeed: for our bodies are indeed nouriſhed and receive increaſe by the Elements, and this implies neceſſarily the ſubſtantial remaining of them. But for *Bellarmine* his explication, it is too impertinent; as if receiving a diſpoſition to immortality,

could satisfie their saying, that our bodies are nourished and receive increase, which we finde to be real upon the receiving the Elements as well as any other Bread or Wine; and to say they receive that dispositon *ex contactu corporis Christi*, is to say Christs body is touched by ours, when as this manner of the Romish real presence enforces them to say, Christs body in the Sacrament is impalpable, and cannot be touched or felt.

Let me adde here how Cardinal *Perron* in his Letter to Master *Casaubon*, waving as it were Transubstantiation, layes the whole *Importance of the Sacrament* on the real presence, *viz.* our Communion or substantial Union to the Body of Christ; citing S. *Cyrill*, who calls it the *Knot of our Union with God*. Observe first, that Transubstantiation it seems is not necessary to this *importance of the Sacrament*, our Union with Christ: see we if their real presence (which divided from Transubstantiation must needs fall in with the *Lutheran* Consubstantiation) will be necessary to it. It is true that the *importance of the Sacrament* is our Union with Christ, and for that Union we acknowledge there must be a real presence of

Christs

Christs body to those it is united to in the Sacrament; and so a real presence or Communication of the Body of Christ, we hold, and a real Union: but as this Union is spiritual, so is the Presence too: yet real, yea most real, as when our Saviour said, *My flesh is meat indeed, &c. John* 6. it was really so, did really nourish, yet spiritually.

Now secondly, would I know, how such a real presence as they contend for (*viz.* a corporal, carnal, or contradistinct to spiritual) can be necessary to the importance of the Sacrament: for that real presence being the bodily communication of Christs body, as it is not the thing of the Sacrament, or *the importance* of it, *viz.* our Union with Christ, (for all unworthy receivers have that bodily communication of his *body* into their *mouthes* and *stomacks*) so cannot it be any help to, or pledge and assurance of our substantial and true Union with Christ: for their real presence communicates his body to our bodies, without any sense and feeling, nay against sense, and so cannot be any pledge or sacramental confirmation to us of receiving him spiritually: also it conveyes his body through the

mouth without any real eating, and ſo cannot be any repreſentation or aſſurance of our ſpiritual eating: Laſtly, it makes his body ſtay a while in the ſtomack, without any union or incorporation, and ſo cannot make any way to the working or aſſuring our reall Union with Chriſt, our nouriſhing by his body and blood. Of ſuch *importance* is their real preſence or bodily communication, that it makes for nothing but to deſtroy the Sacrament, and to take away the real eating of the Sacramental bread, the real incorporation of it into our bodies, the real nouriſhment received by it: all which are neceſſary in the Sacrament, to teſtifie and help our ſpiritual eating of Chriſts body, our nouriſhing by it, our Union with him, which is the *importance of the Sacrament*. And this of our ſpiritual eating and union is well ſet out by the Fathers, that have written upon *John* 6. eſpecially by S. *Auguſtine*, yea and well expreſſed by the Councel of *Florence*; *Hujus Sacramenti effectus* (or as the Cardinal, *the importance of this Sacrament*) *quem in anima operatur dignè ſumentis, eſt adunatio hominis ad Chriſtum, The effect of this Sacrament which it works upon the*

the ſoul of the worthy Receiver, is the uniting of a man to Chriſt, (and this I hope is a ſpiritual communication) and then further, *Omnem effectum, quem materialis cibus & potus quoad vitam agunt corporalem, hoc Idem quoad vitam ſpiritualem & hoc Sacramentum operatur, Every effect, which material meat and drink hath, as to the bodily life, the ſame doth this Sacrament work as to the ſpiritual life.* What Proteſtant could have ſpoken better, to ſet out the ſpiritual communication of Chriſts body and blood, our incorporation into him, union with him, ſignified and wrought by the ſacramental communication, incorporation and nouriſhment of the Elements?

Again, we oppoſe in ſome points the *deeds* of the Fathers againſt their *phraſes*. *Phraſes* may be careleſly (at firſt) or figuratively ſpoken, and may in time be altered and corrupted, but *deeds* remain in Hiſtory, and *deeds* upon controverſie ſpeak the judgment indeed of the perſons intereſſed: ſuch we alledge. As for example, againſt thoſe many Eulogies and high expreſſions which the Fathers uſed to the magnifying of the Church of *Rome* and S. *Peters* Chair (abuſed now to prove

that this *Infallibility*, *Universal Jurisdiction*, and exorbitant power, challenged by the Bishop of *Rome*, was acknowledged by Antiquity) we bring *deeds*, and those upon contestation: as the standing out of *Polycrates* and all the *Asian* Bishops against the sentence of Pope *Victor*: also in the contestation between S. *Cyprian* and Pope *Stephen*, it is easily seen that *Cyprian* by all those speeches he had used to the magnifying of the Roman See (and many they alledge out of him) meant nothing lesse, than to ascribe to that See, what of late Ages they have challenged. So in the contestation between the Roman See and the African Bishops (among whom S. *Augustine* was one, and one that used to speak sometimes very high of the Roman Church) in the business of Appeals, we see their judgement by their *deeds*.

We see also by this, how that which is spoken by the Fathers, may prove but uncertainly and unwarily spoken, when it comes to the Trial, and farre short of that the Church of *Rome* would have us believe they meant. For it cannot be denied, but the Fathers often speak with a Latitude, and apply things to the present advantage.

advantage. As when they had to doe with Hereſies newly ſprung up, they uſually oppoſed the eminency of the Church of *Rome* (as then indeed it was eminent both for ſucceſſion and doctrine) ſetting it out with glorious Titles: or when the Eaſtern Biſhops needed relief, (for the Weſt enjoyed peace for the moſt part of the four firſt Centuries, when the Eaſt was much troubled) and applied themſelves to *Rome* for help (as *Athanaſius*, *Chryſoſtome*, and others) that their cauſe might be judged in the Weſt by the Pope and his Councel, when they could have no juſtice in the Eaſt: no mervail if by ſuch applications, the Church and Biſhop of *Rome* gained many high Titles and acknowledgments from ſuch diſtreſſed perſons, and their Wel-wiſhers. But when it came to a conteſtation with *Rome* it ſelf (as in the caſes above-mentioned, wherein *Cyprian*, *Auguſtine*, and others, were engaged at ſeveral times) it is plainly ſeen that thoſe Teſtimonies which *Cyprian*, *Auguſtine*, and others had given in ſo high a ſtrain, meant not what they ſeemed at firſt ſight to atteſt, or what the Cardinal and other Romiſh writers bring them for.

Now they muſt acknowledge this uſed

ſometimes by the Fathers, to apply their ſpeech to the preſent advantage, (not indeed contradicting what they meant, but moderating what before they ſpake more unwarily) for the Cardinal obſerves the like of them, *l.*4,*c.*3. That before the Arrians aroſe, the Interpretation of that place *of the Rock*, *Mat.* 16. run upon the perſon of *Peter*: but afterwards the Fathers finding the advantage of the place againſt the Arrians, interpreted it of the Confeſſion which *Peter* made, that *Chriſt was the Son of the living God*: to this purpoſe he there. And it comes all to this. The Fathers before ſpake unwarily, but afterward ſpake as they ſaw they had reaſon. Yet thus it fared in this great point of *Romes* greatneſs, for which they pretend the Fathers.

Therefore to conclude the ſecond point: the Romaniſts have the ſhadow, the ſhell, the name, the phraſe many times, but we carry the ſubſtance, ſhew the thing, the ſenſe, the judgement, the deeds of Antiquity.

3. Sometimes we meet with *beginnings* of opinions and practiſes in the compaſſe of the firſt four Ages, which the Church of *Rome* did after form into a fixt belief and

and practice; but it was not so then. Then indeed the seeds were scattered, out of the which by degrees sprang some of this forbidden fruit, which the Roman Church now holds forth. As for Example, The opinion of a *purging fire* was then but in the wandring conceits of some few (as above insinuated in this Chap.) and which is to be further noted, those few into whose conceits it first entred, were of the *Greek* Fathers; yet so little did it prevail in that Church, that to this day it is not improved into a doctrine or belief of the Church among the *Greeks*. Which shews it rested but in the conceit of some particular men.

So for the point of *Invocation*, we finde beginning given to that practice in the fourth Century, by Rhetorical Apostrophe's used in their Orations for the Dead, by the excesse of devotion and honour that some were carried with towards the blessed Martyrs, breaking out sometimes into compellations of them, and uttering their desires to them, as if they had been present.

Here we have a private practice begun by some few, not grounded upon any doctrine of the Church. And long time

after it was, ere it crept into the Letanies or publick offices of the Church. So in the point of the *half-Communion*, we meet with some *private* practice, some receiving the bread only in a case of necessity, but *publickly* it was ever administred in both kindes, and also privately, where and when it could. And many expres declarations we meet with against receiving it in one kinde; and when it was received so, it was held an imperfect, and not full Communion; This is most plain in Antiquity for above 1000 years.

And now whoever will examine well the flourish of Card: *Perroun* in his first book, *cap.* 18. (where running through all the points of Romish faith and practice, he affirms the antient Church to have held and practised so) will no question finde, that, what is there alledged, falls short of proving the doctrine or practise of the ancient Church, and that the Card. often gives us the Name without the Thing, or the Phrase without the Romish sense, or some private opinion for the doctrine of the Church; or some beginning practise for an established one; or a private practice for the practice of the Church. Besides, there is no consent of

of Fathers given in that Chapter upon any point.

Chap. XXXI.

Card: Perrons *two Rules for knowing who and what is Catholick according to Antiquity.*

And here it will not be amiſſe to take a view of two of his Rules or Obſervations, which in his Letter to Mr. *Caſaubon* he gives us, to ſhew what is required to make a man or Church Catholick now, according to the doctrines and practiſes of the antient Church. By which I cannot ſee how himſelf or his Church can ſtand, or challenge the name of *Catholick*. He there ſaith (in his ſecond obſervation) *That any ſhould paſſe for Catholick, it is needful they be conformable to the integrity of the belief of the Fathers*, i.e. *to believe all things they believed, according to that degree they believed them in*, viz: *to believe as neceſſary to ſalvation the things they believed to be ſo, and as profitable to ſalvation, the things they believed to be ſo, and as not repugnant to ſalvation, what they held ſo.* This is one of his Rules.

Here

Here are ſtrict conditions; yet let us ſee how they or we ſtand bound to them. For the firſt, *Things believed neceſſary to ſalvation.* The Romaniſts cannot challenge us Proteſtants for not believing what they of the antient Church did ſo believe, with a due and full conſent. And for the points controverted (which they challenge us for not believing) let them, if they can, give us ſo general a conſent of Fathers for them, as we finde in thoſe former Ages agreeing in the Millenary belief, in the place of faithful Souls (out of Heaven) till the Day of Judgment, in the Communion given to Infants, as neceſſary for their ſalvation, and ſome other: and yet neither the Cardinal nor any Romaniſt holds himſelfe bound to believe in theſe things (put them in what rank they will, as *neceſſary* or *profitable*) as they more generally did of old for ſome Ages. If they ſay the Millenary belief was rejected within the compaſſe of the four firſt Ages, For that is the compaſſe of Time the Cardinal is pleaſed to allow in this tryal; True. But then it tells us, the ſucceeding Ages did not hold themſelves bound to believe all things as they before them did, nor doe the Romaniſts

nists hold themselves bound to believe either that errour, or the two other of the place of Souls, or Infant Communion, which continued after, even to the end of the Ages fixed by the Cardinal. And will they have us Protestants bound to believe either what the Fathers did believe erroneously, or what the Romanists please to say the Fathers did believe, when we know they did not, or generally did not?

And as for the other two points of believing *things profitable to salvation*, and *things not repugnant*, How will the Cardinal possibly give us a consent of Fathers in *those points?* or if he had the confidence to have undertook it, seeing so many things of opinion, of Rites, and of Ceremonies fall under those conditions of *profitable or not repugnant* to salvation, shall any Church be therefore not Catholick, because it does not hold or practice in every such thing, as the Church in those Ages did? as for example, Trine immersion in Baptism, standing in publick prayer betwixt Easter and Pentecost, and some other, not onely held and used by the Church of those Ages, but affirmed by some Fathers of those Ages to be of Apostolical

postolical Tradition, yet are they not held or practised by the Romish Church.

The Cardinal his other Rule is in his fourth Observation in the same Letter, *Let that be held* (saith he) *as truly antient, and to have the mark of the primitive Church, which is found to be believed and practised Universally by the Fathers of the Times of the four first Councels; and when it appears, that the things testified by them, were not held for doctrines and observances sprung up in their time, but as perpetually practised in the Church from the Age of the Apostles; and that there is not found in the former Authors testimony against them, but in all places (where there is occasion to mention them) agreeable and favourable.* So he. This indeed is reasonable fair, as to the tryal between them and us: yet not this of it self to give a sufficient ground for belief; for how will it hold in the forementioned instances of Infant-Communion, and the places of mens Souls till the resurrection, in which both they and we reject what was generally believed and practised in those Ages? *where still by* Generally, *is meant, more generally believed or practised, and so the Cardinals word* Universally, *in his Rule is*

to

to be understood. But as to the points controverted: How can the Church of *Rome* hold to this, or stand by it, when she is never able to shew her doctrines so attested, believed, practised? nay when as we are able to shew *the beginning* of many of them but springing up in, or after those Ages, as *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Image-worship*, *Transubstantiation*, *half-Communion*? Nay when their own Authors give us reasons why the Apostles, and those of the first Age did not teach (as Chap. 21. was noted above) *Invocation of Saints* and *Image-worship*, to the first Christians; yet must these passe for Catholick doctrines, universally believed and practised from the Age of the Apostles. *A cause this, that needed the great wit of that Cardinal, to make Antiquity appear for it in so fair a shew, and then to perswade men so far out of their wits, as to believe it did so indeed; Whereas these general Hints, that have been given from the beginning of the* 30 *Chap: may suffice to let any man, that hath reason, know, it can be no good appearance, which is made of Antiquity, but a cunning disguise: and that the* Trent *Articles can be no Catholick or perpetual doctrine of the Church,*

Church, but Novel-points of Romiſh perſwaſion, creeping at firſt, (ſome in one Age, ſome in another) into Opinion or practice, and ſo by degrees gathering ſtrength, till they were aſſerted by the moſt and chiefeſt in that Communion, and defended for the doctrine of that Church, and at length coined into Articles of Faith, as the Catholick doctrine of all Ages, and of the whole Church.

The End.

The Contents.

OF the Division of the English and Romish Church, upon the Reformation. 1

Chap. I.

We set not up a new Church, but were the same Christian Church before and after the Reformation. 4

Chap. II.

The demand of Professors in all Ages. We can shew it better than they. 9

Chap. III.

How they and we are said to differ in Essentials. 12

Chap. IV.

Particular Churches may reform; Especially when a General Councel cannot be expected. 15

Chap. V.

We not guilty of Schism. The guilt of the breach lies on the Romanists. 20

Chap.

Chap. VI.

How neceſſity of dividing Communion ariſes. 24

Chap. VII.

Sectaries cannot make the Plea that we doe. 28

Chap. VIII.

Of the uſe of Reaſon and Judgment in private men. 31

Chap. IX.

Of diſſenting from the publick Judgment. 35

Chap. X.

Poſſibility of juſt diſſenting. 39

Chap XI.

How farre the Romaniſts leave men the uſe of their Reaſon and Judgment. 47

Chap. XII.

Of knowing the Church by the marks of Eminencie, Perpetuity, *&c.* 51

Chap. XIII.

Our way opens not a gap to Sectaries. 57

Chap. XIV.

The Romaniſts vain pretence of Infallibility. 63

Chap.

Chap. XV.

Dividing from the Roman Church is not a dividing from the Catholick. 66

Chap. XVI.

The Greek Church, a Church, and part of the Catholick. 69

Chap. XVII.

Of agreement and external Communion betwixt the parts of the Catholick Church. 73

Chap. XVIII.

The want of that does not alwaies make guilty of Schism. 75

Chap. XIX.

Our case and that of the Donatists not alike. 78

Chap. XX.

Of Hell-Gates not prevailing against the Church. 82

Chap. XXI.

Of the Trial of Doctrines by Scripture. 91

Chap. XXII.

Sufficient perfection of the Scripture, as a Rule. 95

Chap.

Chap. XXIII.
Of Tradition, which we allow. 96

Chap. XXIV.
Their arguments against Scriptures sufficiency, and for Traditions. 103

Chap. XXV.
The evidence of Antiquity in the point. 114

Chap. XXVI.
Of the Perspicuity and Interpretation of Scripture. 119

Chap. XXVII.
Of a visible Infallible Judge or Interpreter. 125

Chap. XXVIII.
Of certainty of belief, and whether they or we have better means for it. 146

Chap. XXIX.
Of the other Rule of Trial, by Consent of Antiquity, and the Romanists vain boasting of the Fathers. 157

Chap. XXX.
Application of the Rule to their Doctrine in several points. 161

Chap.

CHAP. XXXI.

Card: Perrons *two Rules for knowing who and what is Catholick according to Antiquity.* 179

The end of the Table.

¶ A Catalogue of ſome Books printed for *Richard Royſton*, at the Angel in Ivie-lane,

By *H. Ferne*, D. D.

Epiſcopacy and Presbytery conſidered, in 4°.

A Sermon preached at the Iſle of Wight, *before his Majeſtie*, in 4°.

Now in the Preſſe,

A Compendious Diſcourſe upon the Caſe, as it ſtands between the Church of England *and of* Rome *on the one ſide; and again between the ſame Church of* England, *and thoſe Congregations, which (of what perſwaſion ſoever) have divided from it, on the other ſide.* Part I. in 12°.